AN

ESSAY

ON

DESIGN

IN

GARDENING.

GR III

58 g 34

AN ESSAY ON DESIGN IN GARDENING,

FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCLXVIII.

NOW GREATLY AUGMENTED.

ALSO

A REVISAL

OF SEVERAL LATER PUBLICATIONS ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

By GEORGE MASON.

And ſure there ſeem of human kind
Some born to ſhun the ſolemn ſtrife;
Some for amuſive taſks deſign'd,
To ſoothe the certain ills of life,
Grace its lone vales with many a budding roſe,
New founts of bliſs diſcloſe,
Call forth refreſhing ſhades, and decorate repoſe.

SHENSTONE'S *Rural Elegance.*

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH,
FOR BENJAMIN AND JOHN WHITE,
FLEET-STREET.

MDCC XCV.

G.R. III.
BRITISH MUSEUM

AS TO AN EXCELLENT

JUDGE OF LANDSCAPE,

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

LADY CHARLOTTE CURZON,

DAUGHTER TO THE GLORIOUS

EARL HOWE,

THIS ESSAY

IS MOST RESPECTFULLY

INSCRIBED BY THE AUTHOR;

HAPPY, MIGHT HIS BOOK

IN ANY DEGREE PARTICIPATE

OF THAT GENERAL ESTEEM,

WHICH ACCOMPANIES ITS PATRONESS,

ADVERTISEMENT.

This little eſſay was firſt publiſhed (without the writer's name) in 1768. Of this circumſtance it was thought neceſſary to advertiſe the reader, on account of ſome ſubſequent publications on the ſame ſubject, which have ſilently adopted many of the ſentiments of this eſſay. No charge of plagiariſm is here meant to be brought againſt the reſpective authors. But ſome precaution ſeemed requiſite, leſt the writer of the eſſay ſhould fall under a groundleſs ſuſpicion of having copied thoſe that followed him. Such is the meaning of this advertiſement. For the ſame reaſon all *new inſer-*

tions are included in [ ], but mere *corrections* or *omiſſions* ſeldom pointed out.

The reader ſhould be told too, that from ſome very ſingular infirmities of conſtitution the writer has never ſeen any of the places mentioned by him (except Paine's Hill once in 1770) ſince the eſſay was firſt publiſhed; therefore it ſtill refers to the ſtate they were in previous to 1768. Theſe conſtitutional infirmities have alſo occaſioned ſo long a delay in the re-publication.

TABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION - - - - - - - - PAGE 1

ANCIENT EASTERN PARADISES - - - 6

GRECIAN GARDENING - - - - - - - 15

ROMAN GARDENING - - - - - - - - 16

ENGLISH GARDENING - - - - - - - 24

CLASSICAL LANDSCAPES - - - - - - 27

BRITISH GARDENING - - - - - - - 47

REMARKS - - - - - - - - - - - - - 52

VISTAS - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 53

GROUND - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 59

FENCES - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 60

SHRUBBERIES - - - - - - - - - - - 66

WOODS - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 69

PLANTATIONS - - - - - - - - - - - 73

WATER - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 83

MANSIONS

MANSIONS - - - - - - - - - - - - - 88
EDIFICES - - - - - - - - - - - - - 90
PILLARS AND URNS - - - - - - - - - 94
STATUES - - - - - - - - - - - - - 95
CONVENIENCE - - - - - - - - - - - 96
MISCELLANEOUS - - - - - - - - - - 99
DISCUSSION - - - - - - - - - - - 105
KENT - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 105
SOUTHCOTE - - - - - - - - - - - - 113
HAMILTON - - - - - - - - - - - - 115
LYTTELTON - - - - - - - - - - - - 115
PITT - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 116
SHENSTONE - - - - - - - - - - - - 117
MORRIS - - - - - - - - - - - - - 122
WRIGHT - - - - - - - - - - - - - 124
BROWN - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 128
CONCLUSION - - - - - - - - - - - 144

PUBLI-

PUBLICATIONS REVISED.

OBSERVATIONS, &c. - - - - - - - - 149
ENGLISH GARDEN - - - - - - - - - 162
VILLAGE MEMOIRS - - - - - - - - 165
Mr. WALPOLE's TREATISE - - - - - 167
Appendix on Bowers - - - - - - - 174
ESSAY ON PICTURESQUE - - - - - 185

Ode of Horace paraphrased - - 210
Verses to Georgiana Dowager
Countess Spencer - - - - - - 214

ERRATA.

Page 2, in the note, after *attentive* insert a comma.
5, line 3, after *gardening* dele the comma,
14, line 2, and p. 116, l. 12, for *in*closure read *en*closure.
61, line 12, for *chuſe* read *chooſe*.
78, line 13 and 18, for *in* read *within*.
112, line 14, for *deſign* read *deſire*.
157, line 3, *don't* is miſquoted from Mr. WALPOLE'S Treatiſe for *does not mean to*.
174, line 3, after *parlour* dele the comma.
178, in firſt note, for 667 read 67.
182, The two marks of reference [* and †] ſhould change places in the *text*.
185, line 11, for *particularly* read *peculiarly*.
188, line 10, for *reader's* read *reader*.
201, line 16, for *terror's* read *terror*.

AN

ESSAY, &c.

DESIGN is an extenſive province, *Gardening* one of its diſtricts---a diſtrict of ſo various an appearance, as hardly to be known for the ſame country in different periods of time. Wherein conſiſts its greateſt beauty*, has not yet been agreed upon. Nor can it be wondered at, when ſome † have pretended that the very idea of *beauty* itſelf is idle and viſionary. Yet taſte is by no means arbitrary, however difficult to be marked by the accurate lines of definition. D'ALEMBERT gives the beſt account of it, when he ſays, "The truth is, that the ſource

[* *Beauty* is here uſed in its moſt extended ſignification.]

[† This notion was advanced in an anonymous pamphlet called 'the Inveſtigator,' now almoſt forgotten.]

" of our pleaſures, and of our diſguſts lies " ſolely and entirely within ourſelves; ſo " that, if we reflect with attention upon " our mental frame, we ſhall find therein " general and invariable rules of taſte*." Or in other words, 'The approbation of 'attentive minds is the trueſt criterion of 'beauty.' Though this deſcription of a mental faculty is liable to be charged with uncertainty, we ſhall poſſibly feel within ourſelves ſtronger motives for confirming the reality of taſte, than the power of language can explain to us. We ſhall there diſcover in particular its analogy to morals. Faſhion, cuſtom, many adventitious circumſtances may prevail upon mankind to leave virtue for vice, elegance for barbariſm; but no perverſion of natural prin-

* En effet la ſource de notre plaiſirs et de notre ennui eſt uniquement et entierement en nous: nous trouverons donc au dedans de nous mêmes, en y portant une vüe attentive des regles generales et invariables de goût.

ciples

ciples can ever excite thoſe pleaſing emotions in the heart, which the contemplation of elegance and virtue produces. [I am far from pretending to have here *demonſtrated* the reality of taſte; for I even doubt its being capable of demonſtration. I regard it as an object of mental perception, and addreſs myſelf to the ſpontaneous feelings of my readers.]

If merit of deſign is not abſolutely vague and indeterminate, neither is it incapable of being regulated within the ſphere of that ſort of gardening, which is peculiarly denoted by the epithet *pictureſque*. [Perhaps Mr. PRICE's readers may aſk, what I mean by pictureſque *? to which I anſwer, 'forming ſuch ſcenery, as a ſpectator would *wiſh* 'to be perpetuated by painting.' The power of the painter to anſwer the wiſh of the

[* Our dictionary writer (Dr. JOHNSON) ſettles this point with great eaſe to himſelf; for the word *pictureſque* is quite omitted by him.]

ſpectator makes no part of the idea. Conſequently this definition agrees not with either of Mr. GILPIN's, but rejects with Mr. PRICE "excluſive reference to art." I ſhould have thought it an improper epithet for my purpoſe, if it had impoſed the ſame reſtraint on natural deſign, which the imitative art is unavoidably ſubject to. But, as there is not equal imbecillity in a *mirror* for giving true repreſentations univerſally, perhaps ſeeing a piece of rural ſcenery in that way may be a good illuſtration of the *general**

[* I humbly apprehend that Mr. PRICE and Mr. GILPIN are both miſtaken in the ground-work of their concluſions. They both ſeem perſuaded, that *picturesque* can have but *one* meaning. In my idea it has at leaſt *two*. Its general meaning (according to my own apprehenſion) I have given in the text. But when the word is uſed in contradiſtinction to any other (ſuch as *beautiful)* I conceive it then to be expreſſive of *viſible ſingularity*. In this latter ſenſe it does not exclude other qualities, but only implies, that ſuch ſingularity is the prevalent. Mr. PRICE's explanation is not very different from this; only that he looks upon that meaning to be *primary*, which I take to be but *ſecondary*. If the word *pictureſqueneſs* was not ſo ſtrikingly inharmonious, it would be a very uſeful acquiſition to our language.]

meaning

meaning of pictureſque. Thus much about this naturalized word.] And thus much alſo as to my uſage of *gardening**, I thought neceſſary to premiſe; becauſe of the more general import, not only of *garden*, but of its ſynonimous term too in different languages. Its latitude of ſignification may perhaps be accounted for from the practice of the Eaſt. There the ſoil and climate brought forth herbs and fruit-trees with little cultivation, and in their natural luxuriance. There elegance and fertility were conſequently united; and every pleaſure or convenience, which the whole vegetable creation could ſupply, this Eaſtern model comprehended.

[* This ſenſe of gardening is now pretty well eſtabliſhed; but was more controvertible when this eſſay was written.]

AN-

ANCIENT EASTERN PARADISES.

The oriental name for any of theſe flouriſhing encloſures was *paradiſe*. [What ſort of places were thus denominated, XENOPHON beſt explains to us. In his Oeconomics, he makes Socrates ſay of the Perſian king, "Wherever he reſides, or whatever "place he viſits in his dominions, he takes "care, that the gardens called *paradiſes* "ſhall be filled with every thing both beau-"tiful and uſeful the ſoil can produce." Soon after (in the ſame work) we meet with the ſtory of Lyſander's finding CYRUS the younger in his *paradiſe* at Sardis, and of this Spartan general's being raviſhed with the beauty and diſpoſition of the plantations: then follows an avowal of CYRUS, "that "the whole was planted by himſelf." Theſe

paſſages

paſſages plainly ſhew, that a *paradiſe* was then conſidered as a ſuperior kind of *garden*. And XENOPHON (in the fourth book of his Grecian hiſtory) introduces Pharnabazus grievouſly lamenting the deſtruction of his *paradiſe*, which he prized as the moſt valuable part of his inheritance.]

The firſt paradiſes, which ancient hiſtory has at all attempted to deſcribe, are thoſe of SEMIRAMIS. With her the idea of forming them ſeems to have been a favourite paſſion; for which ſhe delayed expeditions, and employed the labour of armies in decorating remoteſt corners of her empire: and admirable muſt have been her genius in the art, if we may be allowed to judge by the romantic ſituations, on which it was exerciſed. [" Cloſe to the mountain Bagiſtan," ſays DIODORUS SICULUS*, " ſhe encamped, and " there formed a paradiſe of 12 ſtadia in

* Lib. 2. c. 13.

" circum-

" circumference*. One exuberant foun-
" tain watered the whole plantation. The
" mount Bagiſtan, on the ſide next the
" paradiſe, riſes with craggy cliffs to the
" height of 17 ſtadia.----Having decamped
" from hence, when ſhe came to Chanon a
" city of Media, ſhe obſerved (on an ele-
" vated plain) a rock of ſtupendous height
" and conſiderable extent. Here ſhe form-
" ed another paradiſe, exceeding large, en-
" cloſing the rock in the midſt of it; on
" which ſhe erected ſumptuous buildings for
" pleaſure, commanding a view both of the
" plantations and of the encampment†."]

All

* As a ſtadium is 600 feet, the paradiſe might contain about 70 acres.

[† MR. BRYANT, in his Analyſis of Ancient Mythology, vol. 2. p. 100. &c. (the publication of which was ſome years ſubſequent to the firſt appearance of this eſſay) gives his reaſons for diſbelieving the very exiſtence of a SEMIRAMIS; and with great penetration has accounted for her ſuppoſed acts, including her *paradiſes*; which in p. 303, he attributes to a people called SEMARIM—ancient Babylonians. By leaving the

All indeed, who were reputed ſucceſſors of SEMIRAMIS, did not equally take hints from nature in chooſing ſituations for paradiſes. Of the truth of this we have a moſt convincing inſtance in thoſe famous Penſile Gardens* of Babylon. But very remarkable is it, that even theſe ſhould owe their origin to the trueſt ſenſibility of the wilder beauties of nature. This ſurpriſing and laborious experiment was a ſtrain of complaiſance in king NEBUCHADNEZZAR to his Median queen; who could never be reconciled to the flat and naked appearance of the province of Babylon, but frequently regretted

the name of SEMIRAMIS in the text, I am far from denying the authority of my very worthy friend MR. BRYANT. But as he allows theſe paradiſes to have been really made, I am obliged to take my deſcription of them from the only author that mentions them.]

* Deſcribed in DIODORUS SICULUS, STRABO, JOSEPHUS, QUINTUS CURTIUS. [What MR. WALPOLE has ſaid of theſe *gardens* is very inconſiſtent with their deſcription by DIODORUS. Their foundations were by no means confined to "the walls of the palace."]

each riſing hill and ſcattered foreſt ſhe had formerly delighted in, with all the charms they had preſented to her youthful imagination. The king, who thought nothing impoſſible for his power to execute, nothing to be unattempted for the gratification of his beloved conſort, determined to raiſe *woods* and *terraces*, even within the precincts of the city, equal to thoſe, by which her native country was diverſified. Unfortunately he did not underſtand, that the ſecret influence of beauty belonged neither to the one, nor the other, but to the diſpoſing hand of the Creator. The work itſelf was ſufficient to excite admiration, and conſequently to miſlead the judgment of mankind. Regularity and magnificence could never have been ſo miſapplied through poſterior ages, but for ſome ſuch fallacious example. Splendour intoxicates the mind, and often robs us of our more agreeable ſenſations;

tions; and when once the dazzling glare of it poſſeſſes the fancy, every ſoft and delicate impreſſion loſes its effect.

[Were the credibility of the works of SEMIRAMIS leſs ſuſpicious, it would be needleſs to ſeek for further proof of the *extent* of Eaſtern Paradiſes. But, to be thoroughly ſatisfied of this, we muſt recur to more indiſputable authorities in other ancient hiſtorians. We read in XENOPHON*, that "Cyrus the younger, at Celenæ, in a large paradiſe, which abounded with wild beaſts, muſtered the Grecian forces, to the number (in all) of thirteen thouſand."] It appears then, that in this æra and region paradiſes were ſometimes enlarged into the ſimilitude of foreſts, plentifully ſtocked with wild beaſts, and dedicated to the diverſion of hunting. QUINTUS CURTIUS further informs us, that (in Alexander's time) to be

* De Cyri Expeditione, Lib. 1.

poſſeſſed of one of theſe was the greateſt ſign of opulence in the Perſian nobility *. Thus the uſes of paradiſes were accommodated to the humours of different proprietors, but their natural allurements never entirely unregarded. They were choſen for an extenſive clothing of wood, and a frequency of fountains and rivulets †. That at Celænæ was divided by the river Mæander, whoſe ſprings iſſued from the palace. In the royal one at Paſargadæ was the ſepulchre of Cyrus the great----" a turret imboſomed in " variety of ſhades, where the woodland " abounded with ſtreams, and richeſt ver- " dure inveſted the meadow ‡."

[The fulleſt deſcription extant of any ancient paradiſe is of one, ſaid to be ſituate in the iſland of Panchæa, near the coaſt of

* Q. Cur. Lib. 8. c. 1. ſec. 11.

† Spatioſas ad hoc eligunt ſylvas, crebris perennium aquarum fontibus amœnas. Q. Cur. Lib. 8. c. 1. ſec. 12.

‡ Arr. Lib. 6. c. 29.

Arabia,

Arabia. The period of its flouriſhing ſtate muſt be referred (according to its *lateſt* hiſtorian *) to the time of Alexander's immediate ſucceſſors. DIODORUS tells us, that it was adjacent and appertaining to a temple of Jupiter Tryphylius; that it had ſo copious a ſpring in it, as to form a navigable river from the fountain-head; that this ſtream for the length of near half a mile was encloſed on either ſide with artificial margins of ſtone; but that it branched out into various currents, which ranged over meadows, and watered many a ſtately and ſhady grove upon the banks: that the paradiſe was enriched with palm trees, and vines, and every kind of delicious fruit, and by a variety of flowery lawns, and by planes and cypreſſes of ſtupendous magnitude, with

[* See DIOD. SIC. Lib. 5. c. 42, 3, 4. But the period of its exiſtence is deduced from a fragment of Lib. 6; which alſo ſpeaks of the paradiſe's elevated ſituation.]

thickets

thickets of myrtle, and of laurel and bay. This incloſure (as deſcribed) muſt neceſſarily have been of very conſiderable extent ---for a *garden*. What pity is it then, that ſo material a piece of evidence, for ſuch a place having actually exiſted of old, ſhould be deſtitute of credibility! STRABO* after Polybius, and PLUTARCH in his Oſiris, agree in aſſerting, that there never was any temple of a Jupiter *Triphylius*, or any Panchæa. Nor does a ſingle ancient geographer mention ſuch an iſland. Yet may it not be concluded, that ſuch was the ſtyle of Perſian paradiſes in the reign of Caſſander†? Near ſeven centuries later than this period, there

[* Lib. 2 & 7.]

[† The Greek author whom DIODORUS copies (EUHEMERUS by name) lived under *Caſſander*. His work was tranſlated into Latin proſe by the poet ENNIUS: of which tranſlation very ſcanty fragments remain. Such was the authority of ENNIUS with the *Latin* poets, that LUCRETIUS, VIRGIL, TIBULLUS, OVID, CLAUDIAN, all ſpeak of *Panchæa*.]

was

was one Aſiatic paradiſe ſtill exiſting; and it is ſpecified by MILTON among thoſe, that might poſſibly be compared to his garden of Eden------

-------that ſweet grove
Of Daphne* by Orontes, and th' inſpir'd
Caſtalian ſpring. P. L. B. 4. ver. 272.]

GRECIAN GARDENING.

LORD BACON obſerves, "that when ages "grow to civility and elegancy, men come "to build ſtately ſooner than to garden "finely, as if gardening were the greater "perfection†"----alluding to the progreſs of theſe ſiſter arts, both in the Grecian and Roman commonwealths. For *architecture*

[* This place is rather looſely deſcribed in the *Antiochichus* of the florid LIBANIUS (Opera, Vol. 2. page 380, 1.), but more cloſely by STRABO (Lib. 16), who makes the grove in his time nine miles in circumference.]

† Eſſay on gardens.

was

was a favourite amuſement of Greece, *gardening* almoſt totally neglected. One ſhould have thought the *Vale* of Tempe* might alone have inſpired rural enthuſiaſm. [Of far different humour from his Grecian neighbours was the Thracian king COTYS, who, wherever he ſaw in his dominions any venerable ſhades accompanied with plentiful ſprings, there he fixed an abode for the purpoſe of enjoying the ſcenery. Of theſe retired ſeats he had erected a conſiderable number, and delighted in continually removing from one of them to another†.]

ROMAN GARDENING.

Roman gardens are hardly mentioned before the days of LUCULLUS. [His (according to Plutarch's life of him) were in the

* Fully deſcribed at the beginning of the third book of ÆLIAN's various hiſtory.

[† ATHENÆUS, Lib. 12. c. 8.]

higheſt

higheſt degree ſuperb and luxurious. The principal works in them ſeem to have been thoſe pieces of water, which it was the faſhion at that time to dignify with the pompous titles of *Nilus* and *Euripus*. Theſe VARRO ridicules for their amazing *ſumptuoſity:* which indeed was the only part of them, that could conſiſtently be cenſured by VARRO: for, whatever *figures* were given them, they could hardly be more reprehenſible in that reſpect, than his own pair of oblong * fiſh-ponds. CICERO with better judgment makes his friend Atticus hold cheap thoſe magnificent waters, in compariſon with the natural ſtream of the river Fibrenus, where a ſmall iſland accidentally divided it †. Yet CICERO had a *Nilus* of his own at Arcanum, and much commends

[* De re ruſticâ, Lib. 3. c. 5. ſec. 12.]
[† CIC. de legibus, Lib. 2. near the beginning.]

the contriver of it*. It is but fair then to allow, that the plan of it might have been natural. But two lines of PROPERTIUS ſeem to intimate, that (at the time of their being written) currents of water, as well as figures of plants, were injudiciouſly conſtrained:

Surgat ut in ſolis formoſiùs arbutus antris;
Et ſciat indociles currere lympha vias.
L. 1. El. 2. v. 11.

Rude in lone dells arbutes more ſightly grow;
Untrain'd and guideleſs let the current flow.

Probably *tonſile* trees were coming into vogue, when PROPERTIUS wrote: ſince PLINY's natural hiſtory (Lib. 12. c. 6.) aſcribes the introduction of clipping foliage to MATIUS, a friend of Auguſtus.]

From the æra of LUCULLUS pleaſant ſituations began to be choſen for villas, and

[‡ Ad Q. Fratrem, Lib. 3. Epiſ. 9.]

the

the adjacent territories expenſively ornamented. It cannot well be ſuppoſed, that the Romans were incapable of diſtinguiſhing real beauty in a landſcape; but miſtaken notions of diſplaying their *power* and *grandeur* perpetually intervened, and miſguided the ſtyle of their improvements. [Their affectation of planting trees in the midſt of their city-reſidences is hinted at both by HORACE* and TIBULLUS†. In SENECA's time there was almoſt an ambition of rivalling the penſile gardens of Babylon‡.] A ſuperlative excellence was imagined to conſiſt in ſurmounting the greateſt difficulties, and inverting the order

[* Nempe inter varias nutritur ſilva columnas. Epiſ. 10. v. 22.]

[† Et nemora in domibus ſacros imitantia lucos. L. 3. El. 3. v. 15.]

[‡ Non vivunt contra naturam, qui pomaria in ſummis turribus ſerunt? quorum ſilvæ in tectis domorum ac faſtigiis nutant, inde ortis radicibus, quo improbè cacumina egiſſent? Epiſ. 122.]

of nature *. From their artificial projections into the ſea, and other works of equal extravagance †, we might fairly conclude *vanity of wealth* to have been their fundamental principle of deſign. No wonder then, that the Roman manner ſoon degenerated into more puerile abſurdities. The younger PLINY's ‡ deſcription of his own villa exhibits every kind of imitation that

* Mons erat hic, ubi plana vides: hæc luſtra fuerunt,
Quæ nunc tectæ ſubis: ubi nunc nemora ardua cernis,
Hîc nec terra fuit: domuit poſſeſſor; et illum
Servantem rupes, expugnantemque ſecuta
Gaudet humus: nunc cerne jugum diſcentia ſaxa,
Intranteſque domos, juſſumque recedere montem.
STATII Silv. Lib. 2. Ecl. 2. ver. 54.

[In MR. HART's entertaining tracts on huſbandry he quotes theſe very lines, to prove the effect of laborious induſtry. Such a kind of induſtry might more juſtly be called *labour in vain.* Theſe alterations much reſemble Mr. Sterling's in COLMAN's Clandeſtine Marriage.]

† Contracta piſces æquora ſentiunt
Jactis in altum molibus. HOR.
Expelluntur aquæ ſaxis; mare naſcitur arvis;
Et permutatâ rerum ſtatione rebellant. PETR. ARB.

‡ Lib. 5. Epiſ. 6. ſec. 14. &c.

could

could be practiſed on the ductility of evergreens: [and we are told of the murmurs of water-ſpouts, as an artifice in the management of his fountains. Yet an attentive reader may obſerve, that PLINY's chief miſtake was extending *architectural* ideas too far. His Portico and his Xyſtus clearly, and poſſibly his Hippodrome, lay within the province of an architect; and the *covered walk* (which made part of the edifice of a Roman villa) was ſcarcely deemed complete without topiary * works of box or ivy. It does not ſeem as if PLINY's whimſical fancies had been carried to any diſtance from his dwelling-houſe. Conſequently their deſigner could not juſtly be charged (as have lately been ſome modern improvers) with diſfiguring the whole of a diſtrict. Neither had he loſt his reliſh for unadulterated rural graces: the contrary

[* See CIC. Epiſ. ad Q. Fratrem, Lib. 3. Epiſ. 1.]

plainly

plainly appears at the beginning of this very ſame * epiſtle, by his feeling deſcription of the beautiful country in which his villa was ſituate.

So minute a detail of the particulars of a garden, as this in PLINY, muſt not be expected often to occur---in writings that laſt for ages.] After an interval of ſeveral centuries we meet with a fictitious one in ACHILLES † TATIUS. His is only a regular gaudy flower-garden, in which the waters of a natural ſpring are conducted into a rectangular canal. But ingenious devices were ſufficiently multiplied in a ſubſequent

[* Sec. 7, &c. The whole paſſage is tranſlated in note B to the *Commentary* on the *Engliſh Garden*. The ſame note almoſt denies that there was any rural taſte at all among the ancients. But ſome extracts already made in this eſſay, and more which will come under CLASSICAL LANDSCAPES, incline one to think, the *Commentator*'s negation ought not to have been quite ſo ſtrong.]

† Suppoſed to have written his *Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe* about the year 800. The garden is towards the concluſion of the firſt book.

period;

period; ſuch as---gilt eagles with expanded wings ſeeming to waſh themſelves---fountains gurgling through the throats of ſinging-birds in imitation of their voices---with many ſimilar conceits*, erroneouſly aſcribed to Dutch invention.

[There is one general obſervation, which I ſhall preſume to make, before I quit the ſubject of *ancient* gardening. Whoever would properly eſtimate the attachment to rural pictureſque among heathen nations of old, ſhould not confine their reſearches to the domains of men, but extend them to the temples and altars, the caves and fountains, dedicated to their deities. Theſe, with their concomitant groves, were generally favourite objects of viſual pleaſure as

* They may be found in EUSTATHIUS *de Iſmeniæ et Iſmenes amoribus*. The age of this very moderate compoſition (in Greek) is uncertain, but lies between 800 and 1100; ſo that the antiquity of theſe follies is of ſeveral centuries ſtanding.

well

well as of veneration. MR. BRYANT has treated this matter with his peculiar ſagacity in his Analyſis*, and made it unneceſſary here to uſe argument about it. Poſſibly theſe beautiful features of nature may owe, to their having been *idolized* by the heathens, their after neglect among Chriſtians.]

ENGLISH GARDENING.

[There is little room for enlarging this part of the eſſay, ſince the appearance of the chapter † on *modern gardening*, at the end of MR. WALPOLE's Anecdotes of Paint-

[* Vol. 1. p. 427, &c. In p. 428, line 10th, the reader ſhould be aware of a miſprint of Daphn*e* for Daphnis. To MR. BRYANT's authorities might be added from OVID,

Stat vetus, et multos incædua ſilva per annos;
Credibile eſt illi *numen* ineſſe loco:
Fons ſacer in medio, ſpeluncaque pumice pendens.
El. Lib. 3. ver. 1.]

[† Written in 1770, but not publiſhed till 1780.]

ing.

ing. To the account there given (of the firſt Engliſh park having been that of Woodſtock) might be added from Henry of HUNTINGDON*, that it was made by king HENRY the firſt. What gardens were the faſhion of CHAUCER's days, may be gueſſed from three lines of his *Troilus and Creſeide*†. In the firſt book of LELAND's *Itinerary*, p. 60, is a garden‡ of earlier date than any mentioned by Mr. WALPOLE. From this it may truly be ſaid, that] the embelliſhment of gardens, which found its way into this iſland, unhappily conſiſted of every in-

[* Hiſt. Lib. 7. ad an. 1121. He calls it *habitationem ferarum.*]

[† This yerde was large, and railed al the aleyes,
And ſhadowid wel with bloſomy bowis grene,
And benchid newe, and ſondid all the weyes. Ver. 821.]

[‡ It is cited in note D to the *Commentary* on the Engliſh Garden. Yet the commentator ſeems to have had but little acquaintance with this itinerary, or he would not have produced *Leland*'s deſcription there of Guy's cliff (Itin. vol. 4. p. 165. b) as a ſpecimen of *Camden*'s taſte, without any mention of *Leland.*]

novation upon nature. Lord BACON was the firſt, who attempted to reform our method. He ſhews us at once both the ridiculous conceits of his cotemporaries, and the propereſt method of cenſuring them. "As for "the making of knots of figures with di- "vers coloured earths..... they be but "toys; you may ſee as good ſights many "times in tarts..... I do not like images "cut out in juniper, or other garden-ſtuff, "they are for children."* However tinctured by prejudice, yet was his Eſſay greatly ſuperior to the reigning mode, and probably tended to baniſh many puerilities, till they were reimported from Holland at the revolution.

* Eſſay on Gardens.

CLAS-

CLASSICAL LANDSCAPES.

Such I ſuppoſe to have been the efficacy of BACON's ideas: and indeed, were only *claſſical* authorities conſulted, it would hardly be ſuppoſed, that, even from the earlieſt ages, any conſiderable variation in taſte ever had prevailed. It was well underſtood by eminent writers, how much the beauty of rural alluſion depends on its being perfectly natural; and that artificial ſcenes ill bear a poetical deſcription. Hence thoſe admirable *ſketches* of pictureſque delineation ſo frequent among the Greeks and Latins; more eſpecially by HORACE and OVID: and we are not to be ſurpriſed, if fewer *finiſhed pieces* are to be met with in the Claſſics, a defective or a vitiated national taſte being no ſmall impediment for fancy to contend with. Superior genius

ſometimes conquers the difficulty, and exhibits ſuch pictures, as theſe:

Silveſtria templa tenebant
Nympharum; quibus exibant humore fluenta
Lubrica, proluvie largâ lavere humida ſaxa;
Humida ſaxa ſuper viridi ſtillantia muſco:
Et partim plano ſcatere atque erumpere campo.

LUCRETIUS, Lib. 5. ver. 946.

Covert were their haunts,
Temples of Nymphs; whence ſtreams guſh'd glibly forth
To drench with plenteous waters humid rocks;
Rocks humid, that, for ever dripping, keep
Their beds all moſſy green: whilſt other ſprings
Burſt out of earth, and ruſh upon the plain.

Eſt

Eſt in ſeceſſu longo locus. Inſula portum
Efficit objectu laterum; quibus omnis ab alto
Frangitur, inque ſinus ſcindit ſeſe unda reductos.
Hinc atque hinc vaſtæ rupes; geminique minantur
In cœlum ſcopuli; quorum ſub vertice latè
Æquora tuta ſilent; tum ſilvis ſcena coruſcis
Deſuper, horrentique atrum nemus imminet umbrâ. VIR. Æn. Lib. 1. ver. 159.

The place in long receſs retired lies.
An iſland's cloſing ſides, where broken floods
Fall to the ſhelter'd bay, the harbour form.
On either hand vaſt rocks: two craggy cliffs
(Twin-giants) tow'r to heav'n: how ſafe beneath

Sleeps

Sleeps the ſtill ſurface! neither wants the
ſcene
Or flitting lights on waving woods diſ-
play'd,
Or gloom of horror from their darkſome
brow.

Landſcapes are alſo to be found in THEOCRITUS* [and CALLIMACHUS†. But HOMER does not barely exhibit rural ſcenery; he deſcribes its effect on the imagination.

About Calypſo's cave grew vig'rous ſprings
Of alder and abele, and fragrant groves
Of cypreſs‡: wide-wing'd birds had neſted
there,

Loud

* Idyl. 7. ver. 6, &c.

[† Hymnus in Cererem, ver. 26.]

‡ Though Mr. KNIGHT gives a place to *alders* in his elegant poem, and *abele* is even recommended for particular occaſions in the *Engliſh Garden*, ſtill ſome readers may poſſibly object to HOMER's taſte in his choice of ſilvan materials. Trees that will not thrive in the ſea-breeze had been improper for Calypſo's haunt. This excluded many of the nobleſt.

Loud-cawing flights, frequenters of the
main.
All o'er the cavern'd rock a ſprouting vine
Laid forth ripe cluſters. Hence four limpid
founts
Nigh to each other ran, in rills diſtinct
Huddling along with many a playful maze.
Around them the ſoft meads profuſely
bloom'd
Freſh violets and balms. Hither arriv'd,
Well might a God in admiration gaze,
And at his inmoſt ſoul delight conceive.

Odyſſ. b. 5. v. 63.

The author of *Village Memoirs* firſt (I be-

nobleſt. But a ſuitable ſoil and climate make an amazing difference in the beauty of moſt plantations. Abele *(alba populus)* and *pinus ingens* with it, are deſcribed by HORACE, as forming *umbram hoſpitalem;* and though *cypreſs* in this country is generally meagre, yet the ſpecimen of it in the Earl of Portmore's garden at Weybridge may afford ſome idea of the effect, which a grove of ſuch plants might produce.

lieve)

lieve) pointed out to the public HOMER's talent for landſcape, as ſhewn in the foregoing paſſage; but it certainly gave ſome hints to MILTON for his formation of Adam's paradiſe. Not to inſiſt on leſs deciſive marks of imitation, the following lines clearly copy HOMER.

Another ſide umbrageous grots, and caves
Of cool receſs; o'er which the mantling vine
Lays forth her purple grape, and gently creeps
Luxuriant. P. L. B. 4. ver. 257.

What induced me to mention this was never having met with the leaſt notice of ſo plain an imitation, in any comment on MILTON.

Nor are ſuch pictures drawn only by *poets*. PLATO has many paſſages indicating an attachment to rural beauty, eſpecially in his Phædrus, where the plane tree, with the cool ſpring beneath it, that runs at the foot

foot of a turfy ſlope on the verdant banks of Iliſſus, is a pattern of elegant ſimplicity. The Greek hiſtorian too, who only perpetuated the memory of the Panchæan paradiſe from an older writer, has furniſhed (by the help of tradition) an imaginary one from himſelf. This creature of fancy is well known to the readers of Paradiſe Loſt, as far as concerns its appellation, and ſituation----

--------that Nyſeian iſle
Girt with the river Triton. B. 4. ver. 275.

MILTON further tells us (which the reader is requeſted to keep in mind) that this place was appropriated to the nurture of a Deity. To know more of it, we muſt go to DIODORUS*. After commending the iſland for ſome general beauties of ſcenery, and for its fertility, and uncommon ſalu-

[* Lib. 3. c. 67, 68.]

brity, he ſingles out the following part of it:

At this iſle's entrance is a valley long,
Thick of high trees, whoſe branches, to the ſun
Impervious, underneath their foliage roof
Cauſe day-light like the dawn. Near ev'ry path
Springs in abundance pour delicious ſtreams.
Ye rural ſojourners, no further ſeek
Pleaſure's abode. Here breaks into the vale
A vaſt wide-circl'ing cavern: far aloft
Tow'r overhanging crags of gleamy rock;
Cerulean, azure, and each brighter hue
Succeſſively. Front th' inlet to the cave
Choiceſt of plants: ſome with rare fruitage rich;
Others in ever-verdant leafy garb
Grateful to ſight: haunt of aërial flocks
Delectable for plumage gay, yet more

For

For conſonance melodious. Thus the ſcene,
Not eyes alone enamouring, invites
By heav'nly charms of muſic, native airs
Far beyond ſtudied ſtrains. The portal paſt,
Baſks in irradiancy of gilding ſun
The whole grot's broad expoſure. Flouriſh there
Sweets in full bloom, caſſia ſupreme, with all
Undying fragrancies. Immingled flow'rs
Beds aromatic for the Nymphs compoſe;
None of Art's works, but prodigally ſtrown
By Nature*, with her negligence divine:
The flow'rets never fade, no leaf decays.

Such was the idea of an individual, at a time, when ſome modern writers ſeem to

[* —— —— —— which not nice Art,
In beds and curious knots, but Nature boon
Pour'd forth profuſe. P. L. b. 4. ver. 241.]

 look

look upon the ſtudy of landſcape as utterly unknown to mankind. Yet the author of the *Engliſh Garden* has virtually acknowledged an excellent notion of rural deſign to have anciently prevailed in the Eaſt---by his picture of the retreat of Abdolominus: unleſs we ſuppoſe him to have widely departed from the rule in HORACE,

Ficta voluptatis cauſâ ſint proxima veris.

Let us return to the *Latin* poets. OVID has inartificially put together, what fancy might take for a beautiful ſhrubbery.

Eſt prope purpureos colles florentis Hymetti
Fons ſacer, et viridi ceſpite mollis humus.
Silva nemus non alta facit: tegit arbutus herbam,
Ros maris, et lauri, nigraque myrtus olent:

Nec

Nec denſum foliis buxum, fragileſq; myricæ,
Nec tenues cytiſi, cultaque* pinus abeſt.
De arte amandi, Lib. 1. ver. 687.

Nigh where impurpled hills Hymettus ſhews,
Lies a ſoft verdant plot of turfy ground;
There from pure ſource an hallow'd fountain flows,
With grove (not lofty) on its borders crown'd:
Arbute protects the graſs; to ſcent the gale,
Bays, roſemary, and deep-green myrtles join;
Box thick of leaves ſtands group'd with tam'riſks frail,
And with thin cytiſus the fruitful pine.

[* A ſort of pine-tree, the nuts of which were then in requeſt, as appears by another line of the ſame poem,

Quaſque tulit folio pinus acuta nuces. Lib. 2. ver. 424.

They are ſtill eaten by the Italians.]

JUVENAL

JUVENAL (as has been obſerved by the commentator on the Engliſh Garden *) diſcovers a better taſte, than was apparent in the faſhion of his country. APULEIUS (though an affected writer) has made the ſcene, cloſe to Pſyche's manſion, perfectly ſimple:

She views a grove
Of lofty and large trees, views a clear ſpring's
Cryſtalline fluent midſt the grove's mid-ſhade. †

[* See note B to the Commentary. The material part of the cited lines is

Quanto præſtantius eſſet
Numen aquæ, viridi ſi margine clauderet undas
Herba, nec ingenuum violarent marmora tophum?
Sat. 3. ver. 17.]

[† Videt lucum proceris et vaſtis arboribus conſitum: videt fontem vitreo latice perlucidum medio luci meditullio. APUL. Met. Lib. 5. The claſſical reader will perhaps remark, that the language here is not quite ſo unaffected as the ſcenery.]

Not

Not to tire the reader with tranſlations, I will only add one ſhort paſſage from the Latin claſſics, well deſerving the attention of modern ground-workers. For this we muſt turn our eyes to

-------that fair field
Of Enna,------ (P. L. b. 4. ver. 268.)

of which (after recounting its various flowers) CLAUDIAN thus traces the ſurface:

Forma loci ſuperat flores. Curvata tumore
Parvo planities, et mollibus edita clivis,
Creverat in collem.

De raptu Proſerp. L. 2. ver. 101.

The ground's mere form
Outvies the flow'rs in beauty. By ſmall heave
Embowed, and with faint acclivities
Rais'd gently, to an hill the plain had grown.]

In our own language we have Kalander's Arcadian villa particularly deſcribed; and this was the principle of faſhioning it:---

" Art

" Art therein would needs be delightful by " counterfeiting its enemy error, and mak- " ing order in confuſion."*---Have I quoted that " tedious, lamentable, pedantic, paſ- " toral romance, which the patience of a " young virgin in love cannot now wade " through?" † Such is the character impoſed upon it by an eminent modern. Yet (I believe) many readers of *Arcadia* are ſtill weak enough to be delighted with a work of genius, and ſubject themſelves to the charge of *worſe than girliſh* admiration. Romance is a flattering portraiture of human life; where the likeneſs is preſerved, though its powers are magnified, and infirmities veiled. We view ourſelves in an elevated ſtation; and the mirror muſt be naturally pleaſing: we muſt love the inge-

* SIDNEY's *Arcadia*, Book 1.

† Catalogue of Noble Authors under *Lord Brook*.

nuity

nuity of an author ſo benevolently employed. Is romance a ſcene of deluſion? Greater are the requiſites to maintain it in its purity. The perſons, the incidents, the language itſelf ſhould combine to waft us with eaſe into the region of enchantment: we ſhould meet with nothing there, that might render our excurſion diſagreeable, or bear too ſtrong a reſemblance to the more beaten road we have quitted. Conduct can give an amiable form to incredible fiction, can familiarize our imaginations with ſomething above mortality; but too *ſhocking* or too *common* occurrences infallibly reinſtate us in our humbler condition. Theſe are the *characteriſtics*, which diſtinguiſh Sir PHILIP SIDNEY from mere marvellous-ſtory-tellers, and create a moſt eſſential difference between amuſive paſtime among the Shepherds of Arcadia, and diſguſting prodigies in the *Priſon* of *Otranto*.----[Co-

temporary with SIDNEY was SPENSER: who certainly ought not to have been omitted in any enumeration of "authors not blind "to the graces of natural * taſte." SPENSER's reputation, as a judge of rural elegance, has already been ratified by our gardening poet. As an additional proof to what is cited by *him*, I beg leave to produce the following couplet, though tranſlated from TASSO. †

And that, which all fair works doth moſt aggrace,
The art, which all that wrought, appeared in no place.

Fairy Queen. B. 2. c. 12. ſt. 58.

[* See the advertiſement prefixed to the fourth volume of Mr. WALPOLE's Anecdotes of Painting. To SPENSER is there joined ADDISON: but the latter part of the remark is no accuſation of this eſſay. ADDISON was originally referred to in it for the ſame purpoſe, as he was (ſome years later) in the firſt book of the *Engliſh Garden*.]

[† Canto 16. ſtanza 9. two laſt lines.]

But

But for the ſtrongeſt evidence of merit in the poetical painter, let us look at his paintings themſelves.

Into that foreſt far they thence him led,
Where was their dwelling, in a pleaſant glade
With mountains round about environed,
And mighty woods, which did the valley ſhade,
And like a ſtately theatre it made
Spreading itſelf into a ſpacious plain:
And in the midſt a little river plaid
Emongſt the pumy ſtones, which ſeem'd to 'plain
With gentle murmur, that his courſe they did reſtrain. B. 3. c. 5. ſt. 39.

But perhaps a romantic enthuſiaſt might be more enraptured

Under a rock, that lies a little ſpace
From the ſwift Barry, tumbling down apace

Emongſt the woody hills of Dynevowre*.

B. 3. c. 3. ſt. 8.]

MILTON, as well as SIDNEY and SPENSER, lived at a time when rural graces were but little underſtood; yet his model of Eden remains unimpeachable. [MILTON's taſte in gardening is almoſt as diſcernible in his ſelection of four rival paradiſes, as in the formation of his own. Three of theſe *(Enna, Daphne, Nyſa)* have occurred already. The fourth is what MILTON calls *Mount Amara*; and he evidently takes his idea of it from GODIGNUS. The relation of this jeſuit is only a Latin verſion from the Spaniſh of a Valencian author (Urreta)

[* The ruins of Dinevor caſtle, and the woody hill deſcending from them to the Towy, are the admiration of the preſent age. Yet this is not the place ſpoken of by SPENSER. The *Barry* (or *Burry*) is a different river from the *Towy*. It is that, which is alſo called the *Loughor*, and falls into the ſame ſea as the *Towy* does, but never into the *Towy* itſelf. This river not being above three miles eaſtward of Dinevor, SPENSER has included its banks in the demeſnes of that caſtle.]

whoſe

whoſe account is utterly diſbelieved by GODIGNUS himſelf. Yet here* we may find the original of the fence to paradiſe,

(The reſt was craggy cliff that overhung
Still as it roſe, impoſſible to climb.
B. 4. v. 547.)

and of Adam's

proſpect large
Into his nether empire neighb'ring round,
(B. 4. v. 145.)

[* See GODIGNUS *de Abaſſinorum rebus*, Lib. 1. c. 8. As much of the paſſage, as is directly to the point, is here tranſcribed. Ait, ... ſaxum quod montem ambit, ubi ad ſummum pervenit, omni ex parte æqualiter prominere, labrumque efficere, quod aſcenſum ad montem penitus impedit.... In montis cacumine effundi camporum æquor.... Hoc in æquore molliter collem exurgere, qui ſpeculæ inſtar cuncta circùm loca oculis ſubjiciat. Eodem in colle fontem erumpere perennibus pellucidiſque affluentem aquis, et varios diviſum in rivulos, multiplici mæandro arva, prata, hortoſque irrigare; ac tandem collectis rurſus hinc inde liquoribus, ad montis radicem præcipiti lapſu ex alto defluere.

BRUCE never explored
the great viſion of *this* guarded Mount.†

I had rather have ſeen it truly delineated by our Abyſſinian traveller, than even the ſources of the Nile.]

† MILTON's *Lycidas*.

and

and alſo of theſe lines:

Roſe a freſh fountain, and with many a rill
Water'd the garden; thence united fell
Down the ſteep glade. B. 4. v. 229.

Far be it from me to undervalue the taſte of our great epic poet. He has indiſputably ſhewn it in the *compoſition* of his Paradiſe. But can we ſay, (in face of the alluſions, already noted, to HOMER and DIODORUS) "that his favourite ancients had dropt *not* "*a hint* of ſuch divine ſcenery?" The more deciſive extract from *modern* GODIGNUS might indeed have eaſily been unknown to the noble author, whoſe words I have cited.]

Claremont could hardly be releaſed from the fetters of regularity, when it was celebrated by GARTH; nevertheleſs regularity is concealed, without violating truth, in this writer's deſcription of the grounds there:

'Tis

'Tis he can paint in verſe thoſe riſing hills,
Their gentle vallies, and their ſilver rills;
Cloſe groves, and op'ning glades with verdure ſpread;
Flow'rs ſighing ſweets, and ſhrubs that balſam bleed:
With gay variety the proſpect crown'd,
And all the bright horizon ſmiling round,

GARTH'S *Claremont.*

And as to the poets of ſtill later times, (THOMSON and his ſucceſſors) the influence of improved taſte manifeſtly ſhews itſelf in their landſcapes.

BRITISH GARDENING.

To return to thoſe who wrote profeſſedly on the ſubject of gardening. Sir WILLIAM TEMPLE was ſo ſtrongly bigoted to eſtabliſhed faſhion, that he diſapproves of all deviations from it, though thoroughly ſenſible

ſible of a ſuperior beauty. " What * I have " ſaid of the beſt forms of gardens is " only of ſuch as are in ſome ſort regular; " for there may be others wholly irregular, " that may (for ought I know) have more " beauty than any of the others; but they " muſt owe it to ſome extraordinary diſ- " poſitions of nature in the ſeat, or ſome " great race of fancy or judgment in the " contrivance, which may reduce many " diſagreeing parts into ſome figure, which " ſhall yet upon the whole be very agree- " able. Something of this I have ſeen in " ſome places, but heard more of it from " others, who have lived much among the " Chineſes.-------But I ſhould hardly adviſe " any of theſe attempts in the figures of " gardens among us; they are adventures " of too hard atchievement for common

* Eſſay on the Gardens of Epicurus.

" hands;

" hands; and though there may be more " honour if they ſucceed well, yet there is " more diſhonour if they fail; and 'tis " twenty to one they will; whereas in re- " gular figures 'tis hard to make any great " and remarkable faults." Very *hard* indeed! for a regular figure is fault enough of itſelf to eclipſe all other abſurdities. Little did Sir WILLIAM TEMPLE imagine, that in not much more than half a century the *Chineſe* would become the nominal taſte of his country; or that ſo many *adventurers* in it would do great juſtice to his *obſervation**, and prove by their works, how difficult it is to ſucceed in the undertaking. The *Chineſe* manner (whether real or fic-

[* Though the long extract from Sir WILLIAM TEMPLE is copied *verbatim* (even to the break in it) in the notes to the *Engliſh Garden*, yet the poet does not equally agree with this eſſay in allowing the *diſcernment* of that amuſing writer; but ſtudiouſly throws a veil over the defects of ſome deſigners of his own time, which Mr. PRICE as ſtudiouſly removes.]

titious) has of late years been preſented to our view clearly and comprehenſively.* But is it poſſible to convey any accurate idea of our own imitations of it? In this country the ſpirit of liberty extends itſelf to the very fancies of individuals. Independency has been as ſtrongly aſſerted in matters of taſte, as in religion and government; it has produced more motley appearances, than perhaps a whole ſeries of ages can parallel. Yet to this whimſical exerciſe of caprice the modern improvements in gardening may chiefly be attri-

* In CHAMBERS's *Chineſe Deſigns*; and the whole paſſage is nearly tranſcribed into *Elements of Criticiſm*. [The Eſſay on *Oriental Gardening* had not at this time appeared; and before its appearance the little diſcourſe (alluded to in the text) was thought by many to be genuine, and was commended by ſo good a judge as the poet GRAY. (See his Life, p. 387.) The reader may ſee in the text, that I did not quite rely on its authenticity.]

buted

buted. In * ADDISON's time *France* and *Italy* far excelled us in artificial rudeneſſes: and whence can proceed our preſent ſuperiority, but from the ſcope of experiment? Though numberleſs abſurd plans have been actually carried into execution, they have not prevented our profiting by good ones. For, however erroneous in their deſigns, the public are much leſs miſtaken in their approbation of what is beautiful: let various ſpecimens offer themſelves to view, the difference of choice will ſeldom be material. Thus *obſervation* has been the guide of Britiſh gardeners; and indeed was almoſt the only one they could follow. The hints in POPE's epiſtle are hardly ſufficient for directions: but in vain might we have ſearched for better before

* *Spectator*, No. 414. Here are many excellent hints for the reformation of our national taſte; but that they had any immediate operation on it does not appear.

the publication of SHENSTONE's *Unconnected Thoughts on Gardening.** *Theſe* inſtructions (as far as they extend) appear to me nearly unexceptionable: the following remarks will rarely interfere with them, but are intended merely as additional.

REMARKS.

The elegance and propriety of rural deſigns ſeem greatly to depend on a nice diſtinction between *contraſt* and *incongruity*. To define the exact limits of each in every inſtance is a taſk next to impoſſible; but the judicious eye will immediately diſcover the difference in objects preſented before it. In general we may obſerve, that confuſion ariſes from crouding together into *one* ſcene, what would be infinitely pleaſing in *two*

* See his works, vol. 2. p. 125. octavo edition.

ſucceſſively.

ſucceſſively. At Paine's * Hill the banks of the lake are admirably contraſted by the wild ruſticity on the other ſide of the arch. As the ſcenes are ſeparated from each other by a ſufficient interpoſition of thicket, the effect of ſurpriſe is created by the contraſt: had they been leſs diſtinct, incongruity muſt have been ſtriking. †

VISTAS.

Contraſt of *light* and *ſhade* has a powerful effect in lengthening or contracting the apparent extenſion of viſtas. Is the *terminating* object too near? then at ſome diſtance from it, on the hither ſide of it, the ſtronger portion of light ſhould be admitted: the diſtinctneſs of the intermediate parts, and its own comparative degree of

* Near Cobham in Surrey.

[† In the firſt edition of this Eſſay the *want* of ſeparation was here cenſured; but the cenſure was afterwards found to have proceeded from a mere ſlip of memory.]

ſhade,

ſhade, will make the *termination* ſeem remoter. Is it too remote already? let it be proportionably illuminated. For this latter piece of advice there appears indeed but little occaſion; *whitening* objects being a common practice-----too frequently uſed where the very oppoſite method would be preferable. I would not here be underſtood to ſuppoſe, that ſome kind of *edifice* is neceſſary for the termination of a viſta: natural objects are often more deſirable, eſpecially for a ſhort one: perhaps the moſt pleaſing terminations are formed by the united works of art and nature. A viſta ſhould certainly be concluded with ſomething more than the mere heavens; and I know, that it is a maxim with ſome, that no portion of glade can be there admitted with propriety. But this maxim is rather calculated for reſtraining genius, than correcting the judgment; wildly broken, or

cloſely

cloſely over-arched, the *glade* may create a variety not otherwiſe ſo eaſily attainable.

What I have already ſaid of viſtas, plainly relates to thoſe, the *ſides* of which are for ſome conſiderable length of ſpace ſubjected to view. SOUTHCOTE taught us to form others through the branches of a ſingle tree only; and ſhewed us how the opening might be made natural and eaſy, and (as it were) perfectly accidental. LYTTELTON and SHENSTONE took the hint, and improved upon it; but the experiment in unſkilful hands generally does more prejudice to the beauty of trees, than the *formal* viſta can recompenſe.

[In the *Poſtſcript* to the four books of the Engliſh Garden the words *viſta* and *avenue* are coupled together, as if they were the ſame thing: and *viſtas* come thus to be involved in the ſentence denounced againſt *avenues*. The cauſe of *venerable* avenues was

was taken up long ago in *Village Memoirs*, and has lately been pleaded by Mr. PRICE; in whoſe hands I leave it. As to *viſtas*, I not only adhere to every ſyllable I have ſaid of them, but am alſo convinced, that the poet is inconſiſtent with himſelf in condemning them. For what can be the meaning of the following lines in one of his Elegies?

Then to the ſight he call'd yon ſtately ſpire,
He pierc'd th' oppoſing oak's luxuriant ſhade.

Is not this the cleareſt panegyric on that formation of *viſtas*, which this eſſay has juſt been deſcribing? It may be ſaid, that this method of opening a view is not called a *viſta* in the elegy. But it might have been called ſo: for the word is actually uſed in the ſame ſenſe by an admirable poet, who

was

was alſo an excellent judge of landſcape gardening:

Or gleams in lengthen'd *viſta* through the trees.

THOMSON'S *Seaſons*, *Spring* 913.

SHENSTONE too very plainly diſtinguiſhes *viſtas* from *avenues* in the following ſhort rule: "the ſide trees in *viſtas* ſhould be ſo "circumſtanced, as to afford a probability, "that they grew by nature." But he might as well have ſaid nothing, if viſtas ought to be totally annihilated.

Whichſoever ſenſe the gardening poet intended to impoſe on his ambiguous expreſſion; whether he meant to condemn by a *perverted* word what he had elſewhere commended, and without aſſigning any reaſon for his change of opinion; or whether he only ſlighted accuracy of language as beneath his notice; his dictate has had but

little effect in either way on the opinions of ſubſequent writers, whoſe taſte is acknowledged by the public. For Mr. WYNDHAM in his Picture of the Iſle of Wight ſpeaks of "magnificent *viſtas* at Combley formed "by *nature alone*," and conſequently neither accords with putting the contracted ſenſe of *avenue* on the word, nor with a general diſapprobation of *viſtas*. Indeed that guidance of the eye to particular terminations, which is commonly denominated a *viſta*, has always been (both before and ſince the baniſhment of regularity) a favourite object with garden-deſigners. Nor will I deny, that too great an affection for it has frequently occaſioned much diſfigurement in the antiquated, and perhaps not very little in the modern ſtyle. It was the origin of *ſtars*, with the ſtraight and formal glades branching from them through an extent of woodland: it ſtill keeps in faſhion *openings*

to

to every point of the compaſs from the ſame ſpot. Even this latter ſpecies of deſign I can't help thinking apparently artificial; though each of the openings may be rude in themſelves, and *ſingly* delectable. But when without a turn of the head the ſpectator can ſee before him a variety of ſuch viſtas, in every reſpect irregularly ſeparated from each other, I cannot conceive a more deſirable circumſtance in the province of landſcape.

GROUND.

SHENSTONE has ſpecified ſome peculiar characters of ground, and recommended it to deſigners, to ſtrengthen the effect of whichever prevails. To his remark I would add another diſtinction (very common in nature) of the *abrupt* and the *eaſy*. I call that the *abrupt*, where at a ſmall diſtance from the eye the ground ſubſides totally out

of ſight, and appears again after a conſiderable interval. I call that the *eaſy*, where every foot of ground, which the eye looks over, is brought into actual view. The character of abrupt ſhould certainly be humoured, as well as that of the eaſy; yet I am afraid, moſt modern ground-workers would ſooner pare a brow, for the ſake of ſeeing intermediate ſurface, than encourage the abrupt. The *eaſy* has two recommendations: it enlarges the ſcenery; and it is free from thoſe viſible obſtructions to ocular intuition, which the eye naturally abhors. Still this beauty ſhould never be obtained by creating either a manifeſt incongruity with the adjacent ſurface, or a continued ſameneſs of declivity.]

FENCES.

Uniting the ſcenery of a landſcape is the chief purpoſe of *ſunk* fences. Wherefore they

they ſhould be perfectly concealed themſelves, that we may not diſcover inſufficiency in the execution: neither ſhould unnatural ſwells of ground be made uſe of in order to conceal them; for thus the very purpoſe of *uniting* muſt be defeated.

[The author of '*Obſervations on modern gardening*' enters (p. 8) on this ſubject of *foſſes*; but in ſo ſuperficial a manner, as plainly ſhews, he was either but little acquainted with the principle of their application, or did not chuſe to encounter all the difficulties of reducing this principle to practice. But the poet in the ſecond book of the *Engliſh Garden* goes fairly into the ſubject of *ſunk* fences, and deſcribes the beſt that can be made both for internal and external deception. He acknowledges indeed, that ſuch contrivances are

------- defective ſtill,
Though hid with happieſt art.

Yet

Yet one conſequential defect he certainly palliates. To ſay, that the ſcythe on one ſide, and the cattle on the other create "a "kindred verdure," is more poetical than exact. The cattle always leave ſomething, which the ſcythe does not leave*, and ſufficient to mark the line of ſeparation to a common eye. This defect indeed may ſometimes be eaſily cured by only uſing the ſcythe a little way on the outſide. For by this method the *extremity* of the ſcythe's dominion may be made ſo conſpicuous, as to preclude any ſuſpicion of deception *there:* and mere change of cultivation will not alone ſpoil harmony of landſcape. Where the junction is eaſy, we ſtill admit

The uſeful arable and waving corn
With ſoft turf border'd. SHIPLEY.

[* Mr. PRICE, in his *Letter*, p. 153, has made the ſame remark with regard to the difference of mowing and feeding. It is there made indeed for another purpoſe: and the idea ſuggeſted by the letter ſtrikes me as an exceeding good one, but hardly reducible to *rule*.]

But

But ſunk fences, wherever viſible, are ſo manifeſtly artificial, that a good deſigner will take great pains to ſecure their perfect concealment, and rather have recourſe to any other practicable method of harmonizing landſcape.

One other method, by which we are to annihilate the view even of an upright railing, is given us by the ſame poet. His way of doing it is with an inviſible colour; and an admirable expedient it would be, if the theory would hold in practice; which I apprehend it will not. The receipt in the poem is quite enigmatical, not however inexplicable as to the materials; but the proportionable quantities of each are left very much at large; and I never could meet with any mixture of them, that perfectly anſwered the purpoſe. The chief uſe of ſuch colour would (in my idea) be hiding gates between encloſures, where they could not

not ſo well be hidden by any other means. For, as it is impoſſible the fallacy ſhould hold within a moderate diſtance of the eye, a length of ſuch fences can never be eligible. There was no occaſion for them at Persfield, Hagley, or the Leaſowes: whence we might be induced to imagine, that it was rather a want of genius, that ſtood in need of ſuch aſſiſtance. At the three places juſt mentioned, you are led with the utmoſt facility to the moſt ſtriking points of view, not indeed thro' the groove of a ſhrubbery-belt, but by paths (to all appearance) unconſtrained in their direction. In ſhort, the caſe put by the poet, for the neceſſity of having ſuch a fence, only ſhews the humour of a proprietor, who was determined to make a *garden* path, where a Shenſtonian one might have been preferable.

The poet very juſtly obſerves in his *poſtſcript*, that the concealment of fences is a matter

matter of great difficulty both to deſign and to execute. For which reaſon it may not be amiſs, to dwell a little longer on the ſubject. And here I repeat, that *harmonizing a landſcape* is always the point to be aimed at. Uniting different encloſures, and giving an air of unlimited extent to the premiſes, may be conſequential incidents, but ſhould never be conſidered as a principle to work by. As far as viſion is concerned, taſte (in Shenſtone's language)

appropriates all we ſee.

But (without any reference to actual property) a narrow line of partition is of itſelf a diſagreeable object, and wherever it obtrudes upon the ſight in ſuch a form, neceſſarily deſtroys harmony of landſcape. A place however muſt be very deſtitute of inequality of ground, not to admit a change in the nature of this narrow line by low plantations adjoined to it, without obſtruct-

ing the view above it. There are ſhrubs of every ſtature (down to the creeping periwinkle) proper for this purpoſe within a garden; and there are hollies and thorns for paſtures. Whether there is occaſion for *overlooking* fences, or not, widening hedges into thickets is an excellent maxim in gardening. Mr. PRICE recommends it (p. 227) in his admirable method of making perfect ſcreens at boundaries: only I can't underſtand the practicability of admitting *yews* into ſuch places, without being obliged to keep up a perpetual fence for them; which does not accord with my own comprehenſion of the doctrine there laid down: at leaſt they muſt be thoroughly guarded among thorns or hollies.]

SHRUBBERIES.

Shrubberies and beds of flowers demand limitation: immoderately extended, they mark

mark the triumph of luxury over elegance. The apparent * waſte of ground diſpleaſes us; and the plants themſelves are too minute to have any conſiderable ſpace excluſively allotted them.----I ſay this, in regard to beauty of diſpoſition, and mean not to interfere with attachment to *collections*.---- On ſpots, that have nothing obſervable in themſelves, ſuch profuſion of ornament is generally beſtowed; yet, however faſhionably patroniſed, gaudy colouring is a poor compenſation for natural deficiencies. With much more juſtice has POPE given the preference to that man's taſte,

Whoſe ample lawns are not aſham'd to feed
The milky heifer and deſerving ſteed.

* —— —— tum violaria, et
Myrtus, et omnis copia narium,
Spargent olivetis odorem
Fertilibus domino priori. HOR.

[This extenſion of mere garden-ſcenery was diſapproved of long ago by our allegoric poet; as is evident from his deſcription of the encloſure he has entitled the *Bower of bliſs:*

Thus being enter'd, they behold around
A large and ſpacious plain, on ev'ry ſide
Strowed with pleaſance, whoſe fair graſſy ground
Mantled * with green, and goodly beautified
With all the ornaments of Flora's pride,
Wherewith her mother Art, as half in ſcorn
Of niggard Nature, like a pompous bride
Did deck her, and *too laviſhly* adorn,
When forth from virgin-bower ſhe comes in th' early morn.

Fairy Queen, B. 2. C. 12. ſt. 50.

[* The conſtruction here is not very eaſy: the words *they behold* in the firſt line muſt be underſtood as if repeated. Alſo the two laſt lines of the ſtanza muſt be ſuppoſed to change places, to make the ſenſe perfectly intelligible.]

If

If we except ſome of the ſlow-growing ever-greens, moſt ſhrubs (as Mr. WALPOLE obſerves) loſe their beauty in leſs than twenty years. They cannot conſequently be relied on for a *laſting* effect by *identical* ſize and poſition. But, when they are uſed for forming a *maſs*, the inconvenience of their ſhort duration is eaſily obviated. Unleſs prevented by too ſedulous art, ſhrubberies perpetuate themſelves.

Where the old myrtle her good influence ſheds,
Sprigs of like leaf erect their filial heads;
And when the parent roſe decays and dies,
With a reſembling face the daughter buds ariſe. PRIOR.]

WOODS.

Contraſt will often call forth beauties, which one ſhould hardly believe the ſituation could afford. One of the propereſt places

places for attending to it is in the internal arrangement of a wood. By the various windings of the walks, the cloſing and opening of thickets, exhibiting the ſtatelieſt trees, and by ſudden tranſitions from one degree of ſhade to another, more awful ideas might be impreſt on the imagination, than " Day's gariſh eye " can ſupply us with. A paſſage in *Paradiſe Regained* may partly exemplify my meaning:

Only in a bottom ſaw a pleaſant grove
With chaunt of tuneful birds reſounding loud;
Thither he bent his way, determin'd there
To reſt at noon, and enter'd ſoon the ſhade
High-rooft, and walks beneath, and alleys brown,
That open'd in the midſt a *woody ſcene:*
Nature's own work it ſeem'd (nature taught art)

And

And to a ſuperſtitious eye the haunt
Of Wood-Gods, and Wood-Nymphs.

B. 2. ver. 289.

" Theſe ſacred ſilvan ſcenes " were places of worſhip in the reign of Druidical Prieſthood; and by no improbable ſuppoſition " ſuch as of old gave riſe to temples, and " favoured the religion of the ancient " world."*

†Turning *woods* into *groves* gives an air of freedom, and introduces a variety of ob-

* Lord SHAFTESBURY'S *Moraliſts*. [SENECA, Epiſt. 41, has a paſſage to the ſame purpoſe. Si tibi occurrit, &c.---- fidem tibi numinis facit.

When thou diſcern'ſt a cluſt'ring grove,
Aged the trees, their boughs entwin'd
In high-aſcending boughs above,
That heaven-ward our viſion blind;
From that amazing growth of wood,
Stillneſs of ſecret ſolitude,
And reach of cloſe unbroken ſhade,
Thou deem'ſt a Godhead there all thro' the gloomy glade.]

[† This practice is alſo recommended in the *Engliſh Garden*, b. 2, ver. 156.]

jects.

jects. To what extent the practice is adviſable muſt be determined by the ſituation, and by the kind of ſcene propereſt to be formed. For though a partial opening in the front of a wood (unleſs contraſt forbids it) generally pleaſes us; yet a total deſtruction of thicket is one of the greateſt devaſtations, that can be made in the province of deſign. [Two advantages are ſometimes to be gained by a *partial opening*. It may ſerve to alter a diſagreeable outline of a wood by *old trees* left before it, inſtead of new plantations. It may alſo make the fence of a wood leſs diſcernible. For though ſuch fences are (to the view) nearly incorporated with the wood itſelf, yet by being loſt in ſhade, they become ſtill more conſonant to foreſt-ſcenery. This effect I take to accord with Mr. PRICE's idea, where he ſpeaks of a "foreſt-like mixture of open "grove with thicket---of partial clearing---

"and

" and of ſkirtings of the looſeſt texture," p. 230, 231, 232.] The age of trees is another circumſtance to be attended to in this practice. Beeches in particular ſhould never be cleared of underwood, till their ſize is conſiderable; they only look like the approach to a *witch-houſe**, whoſe inhabitants had encouraged a nurſery of broom-ſticks.

PLANTATIONS.

Faſhion's dictates have ſubjected the *form* of planting to frequent variation. Avenues, quincunxes, *clumps*†, ſucceſſively had the pre-

* Such was the name of a building, that formerly ſtood in Stowe Gardens. [The *crookedneſs* of half-grown beeches I have heard denied. Nor is it ſo ſtrong in new plantations, as in cloſe beech-woods: but the latter is the ſubject of the remark in the text.]

[† When this was written, I did not ſuppoſe it neceſſary, to add an explanation of the word *clump*. But two ſubſequent writers have defined it ſo very differently from each

preference: dotting* (as they term it) is the preſent method, and the leaſt exceptionable of any. But a field for the exerciſe of genius ſhould never be limited by faſhion. The Chineſes are in this reſpect (according to Sir WILLIAM TEMPLE) particularly excellent: "Their greateſt reach of imagi- "nation is employed in contriving figures,

other, that I feel it incumbent on me to give my own definition, which is between both. The word comprehends many *regular* (or nearly regular) figures of ſmall plantations, whether *ſquare* (like Lord Shrewſbury's avenue of clumps in Oxfordſhire) *circular*, or *oval*, or approaching to either. The clumps alluded to in the text were chiefly regular, and moſtly circular, and at that time imagined by me to have loſt their vogue; but I fear, that they afterwards recovered it. This might be owing to the falſe definition of the word in '*Obſervations.*' Gardeners might make it a ſanction for their own contracted clumps, inſtead of that writer's irregular (and improperly named) clumps.]

[* By *dotting* I mean planting at random here and there (as particular ſpots ſeem to want it) a ſingle tree, or a ſmall group:

in ſingle trees
Diſparted, or in ſparing groups diſtinct.
Eng. Gar. b. 3, ver. 198.]

"where

" where the beauty ſhall be great, and ſtrike " the eye, but without any order or diſpo- " ſition of parts, as ſhall be commonly or " eaſily obſerved." [The ſame author had juſt before very properly told us, that this ſtriking effect muſt be owing " to ſome " great race of fancy or judgment in the " contrivance." It comes not then within the ſphere of poſitive direction. Yet *general hints* may be uſeful to deſigners towards their forming plantations. There are two of the kind in the 22d ſection of '*Obſervations:*' *variety in growth*, and *mixture of underwood.* But *diſtinction in ſhapes*, which is another hint in the ſame place, muſt be very trifling indeed; or it will probably interfere with unity of deſign.

The foregoing remark is confined to the arrangement of trees independently of any thing elſe. In a *relative* view, the planter may aſſiſt his invention from contemplat-

ing the form of ground, and from a reference to every object comparatively near. Not that I think, ſimilar forms of ground ſhould always be clothed in a ſimilarity of manner. Such a maxim would evidently tend to *methodical* gardening. Yet SHENSTONE's hint for ſtrengthening natural effects ſhould never be loſt ſight of. With regard to the connection of plantations with *near objects*, the deſign of them muſt be ſubſervient to that uſe, or ſtyle of improvement, for which they are particularly required; not however ſo as to be diſcordant from the general ſcenery, when they occur in any different point of view. As this remark certainly treats of a very principal article of landſcape, it may appear to ſome readers too barren of directions. But the variety of nature is ſo great, that an enumeration of different caſes would be endleſs, and the very attempt to

make

make one much apter to confound than inſtruct. Didactic writers are moſt ſucceſsful, if they can induce their readers to think from themſelves.

Two lines of the '*Landſcape*' are the theme of my next remark.

> But though ſimplicity the *maſs* pervade,
> In *groups* be gay variety diſplay'd.
>
> B. 3. ver. 91.

Mr. KNIGHT had previouſly recommended planting woods wholly of oak, or wholly of beech; to which precepts the firſt line of the couplet refers. The propriety of this rule I have long been ſenſible of, though ſometimes obliged to defend my opinion againſt perſons of far ſuperior taſte and judgment. The *Engliſh Garden* is on our ſide, if I do not miſapprehend the following lines:

> Nor will that ſov'reign arbitreſs admit,
>
> Where-

Where'er her nod decrees a *maſs* of ſhade,
Plants of diſcordant ſort. B. 3. ver. 218.

What then ſhall we ſay of the laboured ſection in *Obſervations* (p. 36), which teaches a planter by petty gradations and variations to deſtroy that *unity*, which in p. 38 of the ſame book is deemed eſſential to *greatneſs* in the ſurface of a wood!---But the ſecond line of Mr. KNIGHT's couplet remains to be examined. My aſſent to this precept is by no means ſo complete as to the firſt. The variety here recommended is plainly of two ſorts: variety in the groups themſelves, and variety from each other. I have nothing to ſay againſt the latter, when the groups are not wanted to form a maſs, or to unite with a maſs ready-formed. But *variety in themſelves* ſhould (I apprehend) be admitted very ſparingly; I mean of *trees:* for a mixture of *thorns* with ſome ſorts of foreſt-trees, and particularly with oaks,

oaks, I certainly don't object to. There may be ſpots, where (for reaſons of another kind) a ſmall ſcattering grove, or cloſer group, cannot well have that formation, which a deſigner would wiſh for it: in this caſe a variation or two in the *ſort* of tree might poſſibly remedy the defect. Where no ſuch peculiar exception interferes, I am partial to groups of the *ſame* kind: I am fond of the principle even in ſhrubs: it tends to make them ſomething: in ſhrubs or trees it accords with the habit of nature. Not to mention the diſagreeing properties of many foreſt trees, and their affections for different ſoils, which are often ſtrong diſſuaſives from grouping them together. By the way, Mr. KNIGHT ſeems to have made too *local* an obſervation on ſome ſorts of trees. The *ſycamore* (which he degrades for ſhedding its leaves early) keeps them longer than the horſe-cheſtnut: its foliage

is

is broad: the old rural poet CHALKHILL celebrates its ſhade:

Beſet with *ſhady* ſycamores about.

BROWNE in *Britannia's Paſtorals* mentions "ſhadowing ſycamours." Mr. WYNDHAM too ſays in his tour, that ſea-breezes don't hurt them. The lime-tree is called *rich* by Mr. KNIGHT; but, except in very few ſoils, it is quite the reverſe.]

The greateſt fault of modern planners is their injudicious application of *fir-trees*. A quick growth, and perpetual verdure have been the temptations for introducing them; but theſe advantages are very inſufficient to juſtify the prevailing mode, which gives them an univerſal eſtimation. Trees of conic figure are by nature unſociable*---not to be allowed a place amidſt the luxuriant heads of oaks, or other nobleſt progeny of

[* The ſame idea has ſtruck ſome of the beſt ſubſequent writers on ſimilar ſubjects.]

the

the foreſt. They are ſometimes beautiful as ſingle objects---ill-ſuited to an extent of woodland-----ſerviceable however to eminences of particular ſhape, if the ſize of the plantation be proportionable to the eminence, and not (as SHENSTONE obſerves, and our artiſts execute) like "coronets on "an elephant's back." They may be looſely ſcattered on a wild heath: their *deep ſhades* may in many places be happily diſpoſed: but when I ſee them in circular clumps choking up a meadow, or prepoſterouſly converted into ſhrubs under the branches of a foreſt-tree, they excite no other emotion, than contempt for the planter;*---who perhaps may have acquired a ſingular

[* Yet this very planter was ſoon after dignified with the title of "the living leader of the powers of nature" by one, who had pointedly reproved what is here cenſured.---- Mr. PRICE has already remarked the ſame thing, and given us an amuſing conjecture as the ſolution of the apparent inconſiſtency;

ſingular degree of merit in ſmoothing lawns, and humouring every extenſion or inequality of ſurface*. Indeed *practice* is an ingredient very requiſite for modelling the ſurface of ground; or at leaſt for an adequate execution. The difficulty attending this mechanical part of gardening has induced many proprietors to commit the whole of it to artiſts by profeſſion, whoſe contracted ideas have ſtamped an unmeaning ſameneſs upon half the principal ſeats in the kingdom. [Soon after the foregoing remark on fir-trees was publiſhed, another kind of tree came into general vogue, tho' more exceptionable than moſt ſorts of fir.

conſiſtency: whether by this plummet of refinement he has fathomed the depth of the poet's intention, his readers will form their own opinions.]

[* I remember to have ſeen places, where (upon a *large* ſcale) this talent had been judiciouſly employed by the deſigner alluded to. Over an uncommon extent the *mode* of a ground-worker's operations muſt be neceſſarily limited, not to occaſion an immenſity of labour.]

This

This was the *Lombardy poplar*. Its want of lateral extenſion makes it the leaſt prejudicial of any tree, when contiguous to buildings; and as for the ſame reaſon it bears ſtanding cloſe, and grows high, it may ſerve to hide roofs of barns and offices. Almoſt any where elſe it ſhould be rooted out like a weed.

WATER.

Theſe remarks being avowedly but ſupplemental to SHENSTONE's, they contained nothing relative to the *fall* of water, either in currents or caſcades. SHENSTONE's advice indeed is nearly compriſed in two words---" nature's province." Yet nothing occurred to myſelf as proper to be added to this hint. I acknowledge however, that a very uſeful addition has ſince been made to it (with regard to the *formation* of caſcades) in the third book of the *Engliſh*

Garden, ver. 451. To this paſſage I refer the reader; but would not alſo refer him to any thing on the ſame ſubject in '*Obſervations.*' There he would only find an indeciſive diſtinction of *rivers rivulets and rills*, an injudicious limitation of the line of their courſe through woods, a computation of the meaſure of their noiſes, and a diviſion of the height of a water-fall into a ſucceſſion of next to *no falls*. A deſigner had much better follow SHENSTONE's hint, and look to nature and the ſpot, than cramp himſelf with cauſeleſs reſtrictions.]

Standing pools give offence to Lord BACON. I have no partiality for *the green mantle* they are ſometimes covered with; but, without any extraordinary clearneſs, when they are properly placed*, their ef-

* —— —— —— Not that our ſtrain
Faſtidious ſhall diſdain a ſmall expanſe
Of ſtagnant fluid, in ſome ſcene confin'd,
Circled with varied ſhade. Eng. Gar. B. 3, ver. 399.]

fect

fect may be admirable. GASPAR POUSSIN's landſcapes prove the aſſertion. Ponds may be likewiſe ſtrung together, ſo as to gain a river-like appearance, or at leaſt that of a length of lake. This junction of ponds is ſurpriſingly executed at *Hagley:* and, tho' an equal deception may not always be practicable, yet I think the experiment could not abſolutely fail---but in the hands of a mechanical artiſt, who would make their broad naked heads the principal objects in view. [The foregoing compariſon alluded to a work of this latter kind, of which the faſhionable artiſt of the time was the reputed planner. "*Watery patches*" is the gardening poet's name for pools of this ſort. On the contrary, the ponds at *Hagley* are all encloſed with ſhade, and never obtrude themſelves into ſight, but from particular points: conſequently they have ſo far received the ſanction of the ſame poet by

by the lines that are cited in the preceding note. Yet (a few lines after) he appears to make a direct attack on this deception at *Hagley*. Indeed his words "ſtiff canal" (according to the idea they generally excite) are by no means applicable; but the concluding part of the ſentence almoſt fixes the cenſure to this identical ſpot:

-------- then leads the ſtranger's eye
To ſome predeſtin'd ſtation, there to catch
Their ſeeming union, and the fraud approve.
B. 3. ver. 424.

That *ſtrangers the fraud approve* is a certain fact. They will probably continue to approve it, as long as the pleaſures of viſion ariſe from viſion itſelf, and depend not on logical deductions. Still there remains ſome difficulty in ſuppoſing any cenſure on the waters of *Hagley* to have fallen from the ſame pen, which ſo warmly celebrated its

its " every watery charm." In the later editions indeed of the Ode to a Water-Nymph here cited, all that relates to *Hagley* is expunged---to make room for a *rectified* concluſion of the poem. The original paſſage however (yet* exiſting) gives us the unadulterated ſentiments of an ingenuous youth, though ſince by their parent forſaken---SHENSTONE might have ſaid,

Oh! ill-forſaken for Bæotian *ſpleen.*

The author of the Life of Gray could ſneer at AKENSIDE for *change† of taſte*, and for correcting in his later frigidity what the fervour of youth had inſpired.

Eheu!
Quam temerè in noſmet legem ſancimus iniquam! HOR.]

[* See the Ode in the third volume of Dodſley's Collection.]

[† Note, p. 261.]

MAN-

MANSIONS.

An opinion prevails, that "regularity is "required in that part of a garden, which "joins the dwelling-houſe.*" The highly reſpectable writer, who aſſerts this maxim, remarks at the ſame time the abſurdity of extending it. But I rather take the rule itſelf to be a relict of the prejudice of habit. Hiding a good front---obſtructing a proſpect from the windows---rendering a manſion damp and unwholeſome by too much ſhelter---are inconveniences that ſhould be avoided. But I ſee no connection between cautions of this ſort, and poſitive regularity; for the excluſion of which there ſeem to be perſuaſive reaſons. A degree of wildneſs in the garden contraſts the ſymmetry

* Elements of Criticiſm, chap. 24.

of

of the building; and the generality of edifices appear to greateſt advantage

Boſom'd high in tufted trees.*

[The diſcuſſion of this queſtion in *Obſervations* (p. 136) goes rather about it than into it. In *Village Memoirs* a kind of rule is laid down (p. 135) "that the poliſh of "ground adjoining to a houſe ſhould be "inverſely as the diſtance." As much as I eſteem the gardening maxims in this book, I can't help thinking the cited one rather vague. My own opinion too is, that no general precept is here admiſſible; but that the ſtyle of embelliſhment cloſe to a manſion ſhould be ſuggeſted by the particular nature of the premiſes. Conſequently hardly any two places ſhould be managed alike. Whether a dwelling ſhould be ſur-

[* Mr. WARTON has expatiated with great taſte and elegance on the ſame idea in a note on this line from MILTON.]

rounded by garden-ground, and how far that garden-ground ſhould be extended on any ſide, or whether the paſture ſhould come up to the windows of any front, are (all of them) points to be determined by identical circumſtances.

EDIFICES.

The purport of the laſt remark was to ſhew, how far a deſigner was to be influenced by a manſion. I now conſider edifices, as parts of garden-ſcenery. SHENSTONE ſays, "a rural ſcene *to me* is never "perfect without ſome kind of building." His manner of wording this ſentence ſeems to allow for difference of taſtes; and he is ready to compound the matter for a *ſcar of rock-work*. And might not ſome other *natural* objects ſupply this imaginary deficiency? I mean, ſuch as a blaſted oak, or any ſtrong feature either of ground, wood, or

or water? For my own part, I confeſs, that of two ſcenes nearly ſimilar I have given the preference to one, for the very reaſon that SHENSTONE would have given it to the other. An extenſive ſtretch of glade, much diverſified in form and breadth, and by prominences and receſſes of wood perfectly encloſing it, is the more eligible *to me* for total abſence of building. There is a ſtriking ſingularity in the view of a conſiderable portion of elegant nature, without any intermixture with the productions of human art.]

An edifice may be ſtrongly characterized by correſpondent *accompaniments:* the difficulty lies in diſtinguiſhing, how far the idea ſhould be carried. For inſtance: *ruins* are ſuffered to exiſt in the regions of *neatneſs*. Nor is this circumſtance abſolutely improper: only it ſhould be conſidered, that in ſuch ſituations *converſion* of charac-

ter is viſible. Conſequently let the exhibition of ruin (as at Wooburn-farm*) be extended no further than the pile. [Though the fourth book of the Engliſh Garden gives a kind of ſanction to *new* erections of *old* abbies and caſtles, yet theſe imitations are ſo unlikely to ſucceed, that I wiſh, there was no ſuch authority for attempting them. Does it not rather betray a diffidence in the propriety of the recommendation, when a note is ſubjoined to defend it, becauſe ſuch buildings may be turned to *utility?* But where is the analogy between their external appearance, and the uſes they are deſtined to? Do the walls of a caſtle ſtrike a ſpectator with the idea of a barn, or an old abbey-window with that of a dairy? How then ſhall they be made the properer objects of viſion by an *inviſible*

* Near Chertſey in Surrey.

utility?

utility? I may be told, that I miſunderſtand the poet groſly; for that the utility is not meant to be *diſplayed*, but *concealed*. Then I am ſure, the defenſive argument is out of place, whatever the caſtle may be: for who would ever think of raiſing ſtructures in theſe forms merely for the ſake of an adventitious utility?] It is a common caſe with *garden-buildings* to be ſtrangely incoherent in themſelves, and unconnected with the places they occupy. Such are root-houſes in roſaries, hermitages richly ornamented, and thoſe ruſtic ſeats which are marked with a *formal vulgarity* by way of rudeneſs. [But almoſt thirty years ago, at a country ſeat (where I then paid a viſit) near Wrexham in Wales, there was a hermitage of unaffected ſimplicity without monaſtic mimickries. Its being the contrivance of an amiable young lady of the family

mily occaſioned at the time the following inſcription to be written for it.

Ere Grecian artiſts decorated home
With tap'ring pillars, and the crowning dome,
In humbler edifice man lived content,
And wiſely uſing, what free Nature lent,
Form'd of materials rude each ruſtic mold:
Wooden were houſes, but the Age---was *gold.*
Hence theſe the roofs adapted to the ſage,
Whoſe manners imitate the Golden Age.
But ſeek no palmer's weeds, no hoary head
In gloomy Superſtition's garb array'd:
By grace diſtinguiſh'd, and engaging air,
Our Hermit ſpeaks Religion's features fair;
Virtue directs her far from rigid pride,
Cheerful her looks, expreſſive of her guide.]

PILLARS AND URNS.

As to pillars and obeliſks, they are generally erected to vanity. Had obeliſks never

ver ſtood upon claſſic ground one ſhould be puzzled to account for their reception. Other pillars may have greater beauty in themſelves; yet I cannot recommend the admiſſion of them among rural objects, unleſs they acquire a degree of propriety from ſomething adjacent. Backed by riſing wood, they loſe much of their power to diſfigure a landſcape: but the leaſt exceptionable ſituation, either for *pillars* or *urns*, is in ſome ſmall area ſurrounded by thickets. [The choice of a ſpot for a burial-place towards the end of the *Engliſh Garden* ſeems to accord with this idea.]

STATUES.

The uſe of ſtatues is another dangerous attempt in gardening---not however impoſſible to be practiſed with ſucceſs. How peculiarly happy is the poſition of the

River

River God at Stourhead!* How prettily grouped are the *Silvan Deities* near the temple of Pan on Enfield Chace!† I remember a figure at Hagley, which one could fancy to be darting acroſs the alley of a grove. The noble proprietor‡ ſoon afterwards removed it---perhaps as bordering upon puerile conceit: but I muſt confeſs myſelf on ſeeing it much taken with the thought, and only wiſhed the *pedeſtal* had been concealed.

[CONVENIENCE.

Though the principal end of landſcape-gardening is to pleaſe the eye, yet that end can never be perfectly anſwered by any thing, that manifeſtly militates againſt the comforts of life, or againſt the facility of

* Sir RICHARD HOARE's, Bart. in Wiltſhire.
† At the South Lodge.
‡ GEORGE Lord LYTTELTON.

perform-

performing ordinary functions. It becomes then the buſineſs of a deſigner to diſtinguiſh, where *convenience* ſhould be his leading principle. The * road to a manſion (being a neceſſary thing) certainly falls within the province of this article. The line of ſuch road ſhould appear to be regulated by the moſt ſimple and obvious rules. Every variation of its direction ſhould be governed by the ſwells of the ground, or by the interference of obſtacles. When artiſts by profeſſion, beſotted with the notion of a ſweep, diſregard what they ſhould moſt attend to, the impropriety of their method will be ſtriking. It may indeed happen, that attending cloſely to convenience (even in its own province) may be hurtful to other parts of a deſign, where the beautiful ought

[* This remark has been written a number of years: which is now mentioned, leſt any reader ſhould think it borrowed from the *Landſcape*, b. 1, ver. 147, &c.]

to prevail. In ſuch caſes the main ſtudy of the deſigner ſhould be to conceal the ſacrifice of convenience. From no one point of view ſhould the whole line of deviation be viſible. I ſay the *whole*, becauſe it is much eaſier to create a reaſon for each particular turn, than for a general circuity.

It moſt frequently ſuits convenience, that the *entrance-front* of a manſion ſhould not adjoin to a garden. Yet a diſpoſition conſonant to this idea often creates two other inconveniences. If the ground-floor is not ſufficiently elevated, there is a difficulty in guarding the windows of this front from cattle, without obſtructing the view from within. The ſecond inconvenience is how to conceal the garden-fence *externally*; which fence muſt come to the *angle* of the manſion, unleſs the *whole* of the building ſtands in paſture---no eligible circumſtance. Hollies are an admirable expedient for conquering

quering this latter difficulty. The former is a local one, and its cure muſt be locally ſuggeſted.]

MISCELLANEOUS.

There is an art in the management of grounds, little underſtood, and perhaps the moſt difficult to be accompliſhed. It is analogous to what is called *keeping-under* in painting. By ſome parts being ſeemingly neglected, the ſucceeding are more ſtrikingly beautiful*. The effect of this management is very apparent at the *Leaſowes*†. I know not, whether the ſame thing

[* Mr. KNIGHT ſays (in a note to the *Landſcape*) that this principle "has been ſtudiouſly avoided." He may here ſee, it was neither unpractiſed nor unmarked many years ago.]

[† This place is here ſpoken of according to its ſtate in SHENSTONE's life-time. The writer has never ſeen it ſince; but from what he obſerved when he did ſee it, thinks it next to impoſſible, that any ſubſequent proprietor ſhould have preſerved its inexplicable charms in the ſame perfection.]

is intended at *Paine's Hill*, when you are conducted to a view of the lake through ſpecimens of *French* and *Italian* gardening: but theſe are too much laboured, to give an equal reſpite to the attention with natural negligencies.

[*Negligencies* in gardening require as much conſideration as any part of it whatſoever. When either *too glaring*, or *too little* in themſelves, or *out of place*, they become conſpicuouſly affected. I will endeavour to give examples of each. If in a paſture the ſheep have made themſelves a bed between the roots of an old oak, one might leave it, as *pictureſque*; but if they have made a great hole in a wheel-rut, not to remedy the nuiſance would be *glaringly* abſurd. Knots of furze, or broom, or fern, if in ſufficient number or ſize, may give variety to lawn; but too *diminutive* are ridiculous. *Tuſſucks of ruſhes* may have a very good effect in one of

of Claude's landſcapes, as ſeen from the diſtance, at which the painter permits you to approach them; but on lands in any ſtate of cultivation they would be quite prepoſterous*.

Eſt modus in rebus: ſunt certi denique fines,
Quos ultra citraque nequit conſiſtere rectum.
HOR.]

Whatever rules may be preſcribed, the beſt inſtructor is *example*; the force of which firſt rectified our taſte, and muſt continue to improve it. Yet we ſhould be aware not to confound the diſpoſitions of nature with the contrivances of art. I know places exceeding worthy of admiration, without the leaſt pretence to genius or

[* The late Earl Granville's meadows, cloſe to his houſe in Bedfordſhire, were immoderately poached by cattle. This kind of roughneſs in graſs-ground can hardly be made very diſtinguiſhable in a picture: ſo the noble Earl never juſtified the rugged holes by the authority of Claude, but by a claſſical witticiſm—*boum veſtigia.*]

judgment

judgment in their deſign. They are like ſome charming ſtory indifferently related: the *tale* and the *ſcene* have intrinſic powers of magic; and neither barbarous language nor barbarous artiſts can eaſily diſſolve the enchantment. Juſter models however of *contrived* diſpoſition are by no means wanting. You will find them within the woods of Stoke*, at Wroxton†, and in the *valley* at Badminton‡: Oatlands will ſhew you how rivers can be imitated: Persfield § may bring to your imagination ſome romantic paradiſe of SEMIRAMIS. Paine's Hill has every mark of *creative genius*, and Hagley of *correcteſt fancy*; but the moſt intimate *alli-*

* Near Briſtol.

† Earl of Guilford's, near Banbury: where there is a caſcade ſcene formed under the direction of the firſt Earl's ſecond Lady, in the infancy of modern gardening.

‡ Duke of Beaufort's; in which park is a beautiful reach of vale ſkirted with noble woods.

§ Near Chepſtow, Monmouthſhire.

ance

ance with nature was formed by SHENSTONE. Not that I would recommend even the works of the moſt ingenious deſigner for ſervile imitation. How inſipid are the copiers of SHAKESPEARE! whoever would rival his excellence, muſt ſtudy in the ſame ſchool as did SHAKESPEARE himſelf. NATURE's favourite haunts are the ſchool of gardening. She appears in ſublimeſt *rudeneſs* upon many mountainous parts of the kingdom; her milder *train of Graces* diſperſe themſelves along the banks of Thames; her *majeſtic* retirements are ſituated on the ſtreams of Dove and Derwent, in the vale of Hackneſs*, and the groves of Eaſtwell†: ſhe aſſumes on Richmond-brow a *gayer* and a *ſofter* dig-

[* Near Scarborough. To this *vale* the worthy proprietor (Sir Richard Bempte Johnſton) has ſhewn his attachment by erecting a manſion there.]

[† In Kent; and in a rude ſtate, when belonging to the late Earl of Winchelſea. A conſiderable hill in Eaſt-well park is clothed all over with the fineſt beeches in the kingdom.]

nity,

nity, making every ſprightly work of art ſerve for her embelliſhment.

But from a general view of our preſent gardens in populous diſtricts, a foreigner might imagine they were calculated for a race of Lilliputians. Are their ſhades in any degree proportionable to common mortals? By the turns of their winding walks, one ſhould take them to be the footſteps of ſome reeling drunkard. [Such are the ſymptoms of a ſect of whimſicals, which ſeems to have been continually increaſing under repeated literary perſecutions. The undiſtinguiſhing herd in a region of elegance will always be aukwardly imitating, or attempting to excel, what they can't help admiring; whilſt nations that are but partially civilized, do little injury to the face of rural nature. Neglect of order, not premeditated deſign, makes Turkiſh gardens irregular. As arts increaſe, they come to be miſapplied

plied to the ſuppoſed decoration of natural ſcenery; till correcter taſte diſcovers a diſplay of art to be there inadmiſſible. Thus, finally reſorting to nature's ſtandard is a proof of the height of civility. Whether ſuch proof actually exiſts in this country, and what opinions have been held thereon, ſhall be the ſubject of a particular

DISCUSSION.

The real ſtate of *taſte in gardening*, as it has prevailed over this country for more than the laſt half century, is the ſubject now treated of. Thoſe perſons, who appear to be the beſt qualified for deciding on it, have ſeemingly the wideſt difference of opinion. Writers are moſtly agreed in tracing the origin of modern gardening up to

KENT.

The author of *Obſervations* minutely deſcribes two of his deſigns----Claremont and

Eſher. In the firſt book of the *Engliſh Garden*, the poet ſpeaks of KENT's "elyſian ſcenes" in the higheſt ſtyle of panegyric. Laſtly, Mr. WALPOLE, with the authority of an eye-witneſs, has very accurately delineated KENT's manner of realizing landſcapes, has expatiated on his merits, nor concealed his few demerits in this profeſſion. All this muſt have been well-known to Mr. PRICE: indeed he nearly acknowledges as much in his *Eſſay on the Pictureſque*. Yet in that book, p. 184, he tells us, that

Mutat quadrata rotundis

compriſes the whole change of ſyſtem introduced by KENT. When a reader meets with a dogma of this ſort, ſubverſive of received opinion, he expects to ſee it thoroughly ſubſtantiated. But not one ſyllable more to the point of this half-line from HORACE is to be found in Mr. PRICE's eſſay. The reflection however, here caſt upon

KENT,

KENT, was directly anſwered above half a century before it was publiſhed.

Can KENT deſign like nature? mark, where Thames
Plenty and pleaſure pours through LINCOLN's meads.
Can the great artiſt, though with taſte ſupreme
Endued, one beauty to this Eden add?
Though he, by rules unfetter'd, boldly ſcorns
Formality and method---*round* and ſquare
Diſdaining, plans irregularly great.

DODSLEY's Collection of Poems, vol. 3, p. 117, large ed.

Theſe elegant lines are taken from a poem, entitled '*The Enthuſiaſt, or Lover of Nature*,' and written by Dr. JOSEPH WARTON in 1740. They are of the more undeniable authority in the preſent caſe, becauſe the

prevailing characteriſtic of that poem is an unbounded attachment to every thing natural. To ſuch a voucher it may ſeem ſuperfluous to add any thing from myſelf: yet I can't help mentioning, that I was particularly pleaſed at Eſher about forty years ago with one piece of wild ſcenery, which I take to be the ſame with what is called in *Obſervations* "a bold receſs which "runs up into a thicket." Even this little ſpecimen may ſerve to ſhew, that KENT had at leaſt one more idea, than that of rounding a ſquare. From what has been ſaid, it ſeems probable, that this paſſage in Mr. PRICE's book eſcaped eraſement merely from inadvertency, when he ſent it to be printed---which we are told by him in the preface was "earlier than he wiſhed." Not that declarations of this kind ought to preclude animadverſions on the books they are prefixed to. Such a notion would oblige

us

us to hold ſacred every offſpring of the preſs, that was avowedly immature. Indeed the plea in the preface is hardly ever admitted by the public on behalf of living authors: it much oftener ſtrikes the community of readers as a ſlight upon themſelves.

Though this general cenſure ſtands totally deſtitute of ſupport, Mr. PRICE's particular objections to ſome of KENT's improvements (as ſtated by Mr. WALPOLE) demand conſideration. He diſapproves of KENT's plantations of *young* beeches. Would he have had him planted *old* ones, as a nurſery for dead groves? does any other foreſt-tree ſooner produce the effects required from it? I am unable to perceive the force of this objection. The next charge againſt KENT is his "thinning the "foremoſt ranks of a venerable wood." The weight of this charge entirely depends

on

on ſome identical circumſtances, which do not ſeem to be ſufficiently before the reader. I apprehend, that Mr. WALPOLE's manner of expreſſing himſelf has been a little warped by his avowed diſlike to the *melancholy*. But, be that as it will, I hold it very poſſible, to break the mere outline of a venerable wood without deſtroying its character;--- nay, that ſuch character may be ſometimes encouraged by prominences and receſſes ariſing from partial thinning. As the particular mode of operation here practiſed is no-where aſcertained, it might have been done in that very method, which Mr. PRICE has deſcribed in his own eſſay, p. 122. The laſt charge which Mr. PRICE brings againſt KENT (for it is KENT, whom Mr. WALPOLE is ſpeaking of) is " his ſcattering " only a few trees here and there on the " edges of his artificial rivers." Averſion to melancholy may have tended to thin the

ſhade

ſhade here, as well as in the former paſſage. Or it is probable, that Mr. WALPOLE had his eye upon ſome particular ſpot, where a few ſcattered trees might be better than more. It might be a narrow valley betwixt two ranges of woody hills; and to have ſtuffed it with plantation might have been choking a beautiful meadow, and obſtructing the only outlet for the eye which was left to it. At leaſt candour forbids our admitting a mere ſuppoſition to the contrary, as a charge againſt the artiſt.

In the ſame cenſure, that Mr. PRICE has paſſed on KENT's change of ſyſtem, he alſo involves "all that has proceeded from it." Has Mr. PRICE really conſidered, how much is included in theſe few words? According to my own idea, all that has ſince been done by the moſt deſervedly admired deſigners, by SOUTHCOTE, HAMILTON, LYTTELTON, PITT, SHENSTONE, MORRIS, for themſelves,

themſelves; and by WRIGHT for others, all that has been written on the ſubject, even the gardening didactic poem, and the didactic eſſay on the pictureſque, have proceeded from KENT. Had KENT never exterminated the bounds of regularity, never actually traverſed the way to freedom of manner, would any of theſe celebrated artiſts have found it of themſelves? Theoretic hints from the higheſt authorities had evidently long exiſted without ſufficient effect. And had not theſe great maſters actually executed, what KENT's example firſt inſpired them with the deſign of executing, would the ſubſequent writers on gardening have been enabled to collect materials for precepts, or ſtores for their imaginations? Mr. PRICE acknowledges himſelf an admirer of the water-ſcene at Blenheim. Would it ever have appeared in its preſent ſhape, if no KENT had previouſly

aboliſhed

aboliſhed the ſtiffneſs of canals? If this original artiſt had barely reſcued the liquid element from the conſtraint of right lines and angles, that ſervice alone would have given him an indubitable claim to the reſpect of poſterity.

SOUTHCOTE

appears to have been one of the firſt of thoſe, in whom KENT's "elyſian ſcenes" excited the idea of improving their own domains. He poſſeſſed a genius in many reſpects well-ſuited to the purpoſe---equal to diſcloſing the ſofter beauties of nature, and to enlivening every path with caſual pieces of perſpective. He was rather too laviſh of his flowery decorations. But the chief defect of his plan was in the narrow ſtrip of border, ſeparated by a foſſe from the internal paſture. Theſe narrow ſtrips are defective in themſelves: they require an

unuſual inequality of ground to have the line of ſeparation properly concealed. This imperfection indeed is only viſible, when you are in the ſtrip itſelf; it prevents not the border from making a harmonized boundary to the internal landſcape. Yet I am afraid, that this bordering walk has been much more prejudicial to the beauty of other places, than to that of the place where it was firſt imagined.

Decipit exemplar vitiis imitabile:

the elegance of Wooburn farm was ſo conſpicuous, that even its faults were impoſing. To this part of its plan may probably be attributed the introduction of that compromiſe with liberal gardening, called a *belt*. Belts may be ſerviceable expedients for mere perambulation; but can ſeldom be eaſily made accordant with freedom of landſcape. They abſolutely deface the vicinity, whenever made receptacles for a long

long and thin concatenation of ſpiral plants.

HAMILTON's

Paine's Hill, being nearly his own creation, muſt in all likelihood have been begun about the ſame time as SOUTHCOTE's farm; though it neceſſarily required a number of years to arrive at any degree of maturity. It is totally needleſs to ſay a ſyllable more on this admirable place; ſince its characteriſtical excellence is not only ſpecified by Mr. WALPOLE, but acknowledged in plain terms by the avowed cenſurer of modern improvements himſelf.

LYTTELTON's

new-modelling of the ſhades, and unfettering of the rills at Hagley, might be even prior in point of time to the works at the two villas laſt-mentioned. But neither are

the rills of Hagley uncelebrated by Mr. WALPOLE; nor can this known delight of the rural Graces, and of the Wood-Nymphs, and Water-Nymphs ſtand in need of any further commemoration.

PITT.

Within a very few years of the ſame period the great PITT* turned his mind to the embelliſhment of rural nature. He exerciſed this talent for deſign at the South Lodge upon Enfield Chace. The foreſt-ground ſurrounding the incloſure was then wild and woody, and is diverſified with hill and dale. He entertained the idea (and admirably realized it) of making the interior correſpond with the exterior ſcenery. His temple of Pan is mentioned in *Obſervations* †.

[* Late Earl of Chatham.]

[† In p. 129. But becauſe the place had then changed its owner, the name of the great man that planned it is totally omitted.]

But

But the ſingular effort of his genius was a ſucceſsful imitation of the pictureſque appearance of a bye-lane, on the very principles Mr. PRICE (p. 26.) ſuppoſes it might be practicable. I gueſs, that Mr. PRICE was not in the leaſt aware of ſuch a deſign having been carried into execution near fifty years ago.

SHENSTONE.

Co-temporary with this amuſive taſk of the great Earl of Chatham we may reckon the beginning of a real improvement at the Leaſowes. Every ſpectator of that place readily allows, SHENSTONE's management of his living fountains was carried to a pitch of perfection, which the ſevereſt critical eye would not wiſh to ſee any alteration in. This capital feature there might indeed be much indebted for beauty to its neighbouring pattern at Hagley; and Lord LYTTELTON might

might have uſed with truth the ſame ſort of expreſſion as TASSO did, who ſaid of the author of Paſtor Fido, 'if he had never 'ſeen my Aminta, he could not have ex-'celled it.' Yet the peculiarities in SHENSTONE's ſtyle of gardening were moſt of them original. Novel was the idea of exhibiting a variety of natural landſcapes by the mere aſſiſtance of a path along the ſide of a bordering hedge of an encloſure; and this too without any viſible attempt at internal embelliſhment. Nor are theſe experiments much worth making in general, but only in thoſe ſimilar ſituations, where the hand of Nature has anticipated the ſkill of the artiſt, by the formation of her rolling hills interſected with dales and vallies. The paths themſelves too were of novel invention. The very plan of their direction releaſes them from the reſtraints of ſimilarity in breadth, and correſpondence of outlines:

for

for *one* of the edgings is totally loſt in the thicket of the bordering fence. Within the woodlands the liberty of the paths is ſtill more complete---the lines of partition being annihilated on *both* ſides in irregularly ſkirting copſes. By way of general remark, I ſhall here hazard an opinion, that this irregularity in the breadth and outlines of walks and roads, ſo eaſy to be accompliſhed in woods, might *partly* be tranſferred with advantage to open grounds; excepting only ſuch ſpots, as are poliſhed like a garden. For this purpoſe, any formal edging (if making one can't be diſpenſed with) ſhould be beaten down and effaced again; and, throughout the whole courſe of ſuch road or path, a kind of partial neglect ſhould be apparently harmonized*.

I have

[* The remark in the text (as indeed the whole of this book) was written before I had ſeen Mr. PRICE's *Supplemental letter* and in it p. 152; otherwiſe it would hardly have been written.

I have here ſelected ſome of SHENSTONE's leading principles (not before ſpecified) as neceſſary ingredients for forming an opinion upon the ſubject of this diſcuſſion. I mean not to tire my readers with any minuter deſcription of the Leaſowes. The public are already in poſſeſſion of many, and perhaps more than they can profit by. For (as the author of the life of Gray* has very truly told us) *verbal* deſcriptions of rural ſcenery are no *identical* pictures: whoever attempts to make them ſo by extreme copiouſneſs of diction, may become inſufferably tedious, but never perfectly intelligible. By a few maſterly ſtrokes a writer enables his readers to *conceive* a whole landſcape of ſome ſort; while too circumſtantial an enumeration of particulars only pre-

written at all. It is not however expunged: nor is the writer leſs partial to the remark, as far as he finds it co-incide with the idea of ſo maſterly a deſigner.]

[* See p. 376 note.]

cludes

cludes them from this exerciſe of fancy, and gives them in its room a mere maſs of confuſion. The clear conciſeneſs of Mr. WYNDHAM, in his Picture of the Iſle of Wight, is the propereſt ſtyle for aſcertaining the peculiar *character* of each ſpot he deſcribes: which ſeems to be the utmoſt in this way to be done by *words*. Before I quit this article, I would apprize my readers, that I do not ſet up the Leaſowes (even in their Shenſtonian ſtate) for a perfect model of gardening. This declaration is made, as a proteſt againſt allowing any ſlight objection to be derogatory from the general merit of this deſigner. There was one ſhort zig-zag walk, one gilt urn, and a few collegiate puerilities; and one or two appendages were poſſibly ill-aſſorted: but all theſe were removeable without prejudice to the character of the natural landſcape,

and bore no kind of proportion to that extenſive range of delightful ſcenery.

MORRIS.

At about 1750 we may fix the æra of Persfield. The difference between this place and the Leaſowes is great indeed with regard to their natural formation, but very inconſiderable in the general ſtyle of their improvement. Morris made a point of conducting a ſpectator with eaſe to the variety of romantic views, which his ſituation afforded. That wonderful walk on the brow of the precipitious bank of Wye muſt have been a laborious operation: yet the mere completion of it almoſt effaced every appearance of workmanſhip. Here a judicious obſerver will not only admire each compoſition of the grand, and of the picturesque, as they reſpectively preſent themſelves before him; but he will alſo be particularly

ticularly ſatisfied with reflecting on the total abſence of fanciful accompaniments. I cannot recollect, that any of the ſcenes on the Wye are the leaſt adulterated by the introduction of any puerile appendage whatſoever.

Theſe ſix are all the voluntary artiſts, whoſe works it is in my power to refer to, as exiſting in 1768. I might probably have ſtrengthened my argument in defence of the taſte of Great Britain by ſome additional proofs, if my home-travels had been leſs circumſcribed. But they never reached into the very weſtern, or very northern, nor thoroughly into many other parts of the iſland. This paucity of examples may be a little (and but little) helped by the works of one *profeſſor* of gardening, whoſe plans were coëval with the modification of Persfield.

WRIGHT

was the name of this gentleman. A *gentleman* my hearſay evidence tells me that he was: and by hearſay alone I can pretend to ſpeak of him. The circumſtance however of his birth and education having been above plebeian was (I ſhould think) by no means immaterial towards forming him for the profeſſion. The works of thoſe, who from handling a ſpade have ſet up for deſigners, uſually betray a mechanical prevalency.

What if the foot ordain'd the duſt to tread,
Or hand to toil, aſpir'd to be the head?

POPE.

Though genius is the gift of nature, it requires the ſun-ſhine of tuition to ripen it. Without this aſſiſtance the mind is rarely fitted for the taſk of deſigning. There is alſo another reaſon, why a deſigner ought

to

to be a gentleman. Pretending by the glance of an eye to regulate ſcenery, even of a moderate extent, is a downright ſpecies of quackery; and ſuch pretenſions have been one of the cauſes of that amazing difference between the works of common profeſſors, and thoſe of proprietors of taſte. Whoever exerciſes his talent of gardening over any conſiderable ſpace of ground, ſhould have opportunities of becoming acquainted with it in every point of view; and ſo complete a knowledge of a place is not to be acquired without ſome reſidence at it. But what proprietor would ſubmit to be troubled with the company of a profeſſor, that has not the manners of a gentleman? On all theſe accounts I may congratulate the preſent period on having at leaſt two * profeſſors of gardening----previouſly gentlemen. WRIGHT

[* Mr. Eames I know only by name. Nor can I boaſt of much more perſonal acquaintance with Mr. Repton; but have

WRIGHT underſtood drawing, and ſketched plans of his deſigns; but never contracted for work: which might occaſion his not being applied to by thoſe, who conſider nothing ſo much, as the having trouble taken off their hands. I ſhould apprehend too, that a garden-deſigner, whoſe art reaches no further than his pencil can aſſiſt him, muſt be neceſſarily defective: it being out of the power of the pencil to trace ſome ſcenes with accuracy---from the principal points of view for commanding them. No mention of WRIGHT is made by Mr. WALPOLE. He ſeems to have been as little known to Mr. PRICE: which rather ſurpriſes me, becauſe I well remember to have heard (about 1754) of an admired effort of his genius on a piece of lawn at Lord BARRINGTON's. The improvement

have heard from a moſt reſpectable neighbour of his, that he is a very agreeable companion.]

of

of two places, both commended by name in this eſſay, I have always underſtood to have been ſuggeſted by WRIGHT. The firſt of theſe is Stoke near Briſtol. The pieces of woodland in that domain are neither remarkable for extent in themſelves, nor for the ſize of their timber; yet the management of them gave me, more than any thing I had ſeen, an idea of what might be done by the internal arrangement of a wood. Some old pollards clad with ivy were made admirable uſe of. One of theſe ſilvan ſpinnies * was decorated with roſes, as nearly as poſſible in the very manner, which is adviſed in the fourth book of the Engliſh Garden (ver. 190) for the ſame kind of ſpot ſimilarly detached. I have ſome idea, that this particular ſcene was laid out by the great PITT: but whether his, or WRIGHT's, or the proprie-

[* Spinny is not an uncommon word in midland counties for a ſmall piece of woodland.]

tor's

tor's (Lord BOTTETOURT) it was a better deſign than the poet's, by there being no occaſion for "gravel or ſand," and becauſe the rural imagery was not confounded with a number of *buſts* and *urns*---a confuſion one would little have expected from an invoker of ſimplicity. WRIGHT's other deſign (if I was not miſ-informed) was the terrace and river at Oatlands. This piece of water (as I have not ſeen it within thirty years) I will not take upon me to deſcribe with exactneſs; but I perfectly remember, that the Thames itſelf, as perceived from the terrace at a diſtance, looked like a continuation of the ſame ſtream.

BROWN

is the next perſon, whom the plan of this diſcuſſion requires me to treat of. For he came into ſome vogue as early as WRIGHT; and the faſhion of employing him continued

nued not only to 1768, but to the time of his death, many years after. Not one of his works is commended in the eſſay; nor is he mentioned at all there by name. His ſuppoſed faults are glanced at, and his practical dexterity acknowledged. It would have been very inconſiſtent in a writer to have praiſed any of that artiſt's deſigns, whoſe vogue he conſidered as really detrimental to the art itſelf. For this reaſon (and alſo becauſe Woodſtock-park had its foreſt-ſcenery, and its view to Bladen, long before BROWN's operations took place there) even Blenheim was paſt over in ſilence. BROWN always appeared to myſelf in the light of an egregious manneriſt, who, from having acquired a facility in ſhaping ſurfaces, grew fond of exhibiting that talent without due regard to nature, and left marks of his intruſion wherever he went. His *new* plantations were generally void

of genius, taſte, and propriety; but I have ſeen inſtances of his managing *old* ones much better. He made a view to Cheneys church from Latimers (Bucks) as natural and pictureſque as can well be imagined. Yet at the ſame place he had ſtuffed a very narrow vale by the ſide of an artificial river with thoſe crowded circular clumps of firs *alone*, that Mr. PRICE attributes to him. The incongruity of this plan ſtruck moſt of the neighbouring gentlemen, but was defended by the artiſt himſelf, under ſhelter of the epithet playful---totally miſapplied. Fortunately the ſoil did not ſuit the firs: they all died within a twelvemonth, and the place was happily rid of them. I will not pretend to give an opinion about BROWN's made rivers, becauſe I have ſeen very few---at leaſt knowing them to be *his*. Perhaps he made that at * Wentworth-Caſ-

* Earl of Strafford's, in Yorkſhire.

tle,

tle, which from a very imperfect view of it I had commended in the firſt edition of the eſſay: nor do I now retract the commendation, though I have omitted repeating it merely on account of my inſufficient acquaintance with that conſiderable piece of work. Why BROWN ſhould be charged with all the defects of thoſe, that have called themſelves his followers, I have ſeen no good reaſon alledged, nor can I ſuppoſe it poſſible to produce one. Would any critic think of blaming Virgil for the turgid pomp of Statius, or the conceits of Claudian? yet they were both *Virgilian* verſifiers. Although impartiality forbids degrading an artiſt for the faults of his nominal followers, I confeſs myſelf as much aſtoniſhed as Mr. PRICE, at the exaggerated encomium on BROWN in the *Engliſh Garden*. Yet there might have been more foundation for it, than either Mr. PRICE or

I may be aware of. Scenes, where the hand of art is inviſible, are often ſuppoſed to be entirely natural. Of a deſign that might rank with thoſe, and which was executed by BROWN, I have produced an example. In that inſtance indeed (from a particular* cauſe) his controul over nature was exceedingly limited. It might alſo have been the caſe in other places; and he might have finiſhed ſpecimens of the better taſte from having wanted the privilege of thoroughly diſplaying his own.

From a general view of the places mentioned in this diſcuſſion, and of two or three more that are alluded to in the eſſay, and

[* The foliage neceſſary to be removed for obtaining a view of Cheneys church did not belong to the proprietor of Latimers, but to the Duke of Bedford: conſequently an uncommon degree of caution was obſerved in making uſe of the Duke's permiſſion for an opening.]

of

of ſeveral others leſs conſiderable in magnitude, and of partial beauties in ſome larger places, I certainly did not heſitate in 1768 to ſpeak of a decided ſuperiority of Britiſh taſte in gardening, over that of other European countries, or of former periods at home. That a majority of altered places had been really improved by alteration was by no means aſſerted; but quite the reverſe. My eſtimate of national taſte was taken upon another ground. The preference given by the public to the deſigns of true genius, in compariſon with thoſe of mechanical profeſſors, was what regulated my opinion. For I never doubted, but that this diſcriminative approbation was pretty general with them, who could be allowed to have any judgment at all in the matter. As to the deciſions of the mere vulgar, are they ever put into the ſcale to weigh works of genius? ought they to be any more accounted

counted of in regard to this peculiar kind of pleaſure,

Loſt to the ſons of pow'r, unknown to half mankind?

SHENSTONE.

Some years prior to the time I am ſpeaking of, writers of the higheſt eſtimation thought our national taſte exceedingly rectified. For proof of this, I need only refer the reader to a letter of GRAY's, written to Mr. How 1763, and printed in Gray's life.

Having thus traced this matter both as to facts and opinions, as far as 1768, I ſhall conſider it to the beſt of my knowledge through the ſubſequent period. The author of the Engliſh Garden's opinion wants no confirmation by extracts; for Mr. PRICE allows him "to have beſtowed praiſes on "Engliſh Gardening," but thinks he could not have done it without "over looking "defects which he had himſelf con-demned."

"demned." I cannot agree with Mr. PRICE's concluſion, becauſe I look upon theſe *defects* as not concerned in it. The real landſcapes, which I have recited and alluded to, very ſufficiently vindicate the juſtneſs of the poet's general idea. Their paucity by no means precludes the ſuppoſition of ſuch an effect from them. Fewer *claſſical writers* have immortalized the title of *Auguſtan age*. In all liberal arts, the merit of tranſcendant genius, not the herd of pretenders, characterizes an æra. I am almoſt convinced, that Mr. PRICE muſt by this time be ſenſible of his miſtake, and ſee, that he had not been aware of the proper light for viewing the queſtion in.

In *Village Memoirs* (publiſhed 1775, for 1765 is a blunder of the preſs) gardening-profeſſors are ſatirized under the name of Mr. Layout. Yet a better taſte than Layout's is plainly acknowledged to exiſt

"which

" which SHENSTONE and nature have " brought us acquainted with." It is ſaid indeed p. 143, " No wonder that our taſte " in England is ſtill to be condemned, ſince " moſt of our largeſt gardens are laid out " by ſome general undertaker, who intro- " duces the ſame objects at the ſame diſ- " tances in all." Here the extent of the condemnation is preciſely marked, and all the difference between this author and myſelf is merely in our modes of eſtimation.

Mr. WALPOLE's opinions on this matter have been partly conſidered already; that is, with regard to KENT, and as far as he co-incides with the poet. His civil apology for *not* complimenting BROWN is no hindrance to his ſaying in the very next paragraph, that the *poſſeſſor*, if he has any taſte, is the beſt deſigner of his own grounds. Mr. PRICE objects to the aſſertion, that " MIL- " TON's ideas exactly correſpond with the " pre-

"preſent ſtandard." To ſuppoſe any ſingle piece of modern gardening capable of ſerving for a model to paradiſe is beyond the nature of things. A ſelection of all the rural graces of the globe is not to be looked for in any ſingle ſpot whatever. But I am much miſtaken if MILTON might not have formed moſt of the particulars of his Eden from ſurveying a ſmall number of places, as they were within half a century. I do not however imagine, that any of BROWN's works would have been parts of the deſign. *Theſe* perhaps Mr. PRICE thought alluded to by the words *preſent ſtandard*; but I can't conceive, that Mr. WALPOLE could have any ſuch meaning; the whole of the context (to my own apprehenſion) makes it impoſſible that he ſhould.

I am totally unacquainted with any other opinion on our national taſte, contained in any literary performance, till we come

to 1794. Mr. KNIGHT in the *Landſcape* ſeems ſo much diſguſted with the wrong principles he has obſerved in ſome modern improvements, as to extend his cenſure to modern gardening in general. Poetical effuſions are not always meant to be literally conſtrued; and ſuch I ſhould apprehend to be the caſe with ſome paſſages in the *Landſcape*. When Mr. KNIGHT ſpeaks of the *baneful influence* of the old ſyſtem being more *confined* than that of modern practitioners, I impute it to his not having been of an age near forty years ago to make remarks on the face of the country. "Kings of yew" indeed were obliged for ſecurity to be ſurrounded by their *guards:* but "Goddeſſes of lead," being under the neceſſity of no ſuch reſtriction, were frequently made uſe of, as terminating objects for avenues, at the very extremity of a park, paddock, or paſture. The parks and paddocks in general

neral were ſo far from diſplaying the "native dignity of an ancient foreſt" that they ſeemed rather to have been planned by the ſame artiſt, that laid out the ſtreets of Soho by the Seven Dials. Circular areas, and a number of rectilinear glades, diverging from them between rows of ſtarved limes, or headed and cankered elms, was the reigning mode of *foreſt*-gardening---perhaps enlivened with a broad canal of many furlongs in length, with a maſſy ſeat at the head of it. It would have puzzled a landſcape-painter, to have found a ſingle ſtation, which he might take a natural view from. Many a venerable wood was decorated in the ſame ſtyle, and even foreſts interſected with the ſame kind of ridings. Honoured be the memory of KENT, for inclining us to deſiſt from this immoderate extenſion of diſfigurements! The ſyſtematic baldneſs of ſome modern deſigns may

have been as repugnant to true taſte, as the pinioning formality of our fore-fathers; but if *negatively good* is to be the teſt of their reſpective merits, I ſhould decide in favour of the moderns---inaſmuch as I think their miſchief not equally irremediable*.

Next follows the *Eſſay on Pictureſque*. Here Mr. PRICE (after adopting the ſame erroneous opinion with Mr. KNIGHT, as to embelliſhments being formerly confined) condemns improvements in ſo unqualified a manner, that his readers muſt ſuppoſe by the paſſages themſelves, that every thing ever done in the kingdom is included in

[* Mr. KNIGHT's *ſecond* edition has come to my knowledge juſt time enough for me to inſert the following remark. In his additional note (p. 11.) he ſeems to allow what I have aſſerted in the text---by ſaying, that "the too "general uſe of avenues was ſtill *more* fatal to pictureſque "beauty, than the late ſenſeleſs deſtruction of them has "been."

This *ſecond* edition appeared too late for me to be able to allude to it in any *prior* part of my own eſſay.]

his

his cenſure, without exception. He ſpeaks of the "preſent ſyſtem of laying out grounds," as if it was abſolutely univerſal, and had always been ſo ſince the firſt introduction of modern gardening. This however cannot be his meaning, becauſe in other parts of the ſame book he commends by name Mount Edgecumbe and Paines Hill, and gives hints of deſigns of his own. Where any paſſages in a book are written with ſuch a latitude of expreſſion, that they cannot have the ſenſe their words would give them, it becomes a moſt difficult taſk to avoid miſ-repreſentation in examining ſuch paſſages. But in the preſent caſe, Mr. PRICE's opinion about the ſubject before us has been clearly aſcertained from his animadverſions on prior authors, and conſequently in the courſe of this diſcuſſion already replied to.

Whether the national taſte has not been upon

upon the decline for theſe laſt twenty years, is another queſtion. None of the celebrated artiſts of true genius have continued to flouriſh within this period. Perhaps their very deſigns may have materially ſuffered for want of their own attention to them: at leaſt they have loſt that bloom of novelty, by which Britiſh iſlanders are ſo captivated. No hearty volunteers in the ſame purſuit have ariſen in ſucceſſion, or no ſuch have employed their talents in a ſufficient extent to engage the notice of the public. And if a ſecond Leaſowes was to be contrived and executed, it would meet with comparative neglect, becauſe it was only a *ſecond.* Amongſt the rich and great, few have either leiſure or inclination to imitate Cyrus the younger, in his pacific amuſement of planting with his own hands.--- Theſe diſadvantages muſt have greatly impeded the progreſs of taſte. Yet even within

within this period the face of our country has been enriched with ſome conſiderable acquiſitions. When I travel through Surrey, and caſt my eyes for miles together (between Leatherhead and Darking) on the hills and dales, and beautiful intermixture of lawn wood thicket and grove in the encloſure of Norbury*, can I have the leaſt heſitation in agreeing with Mr. WALPOLE, that our country is a *ſchool of landſcape?*

The ſtrongeſt mark of depravation in our national taſte, that has fallen in my way within the time ſpoken of, was a clauſe in an intended act of parliament, to put the royal gardens under the dominion of a ground-worker. What made it the more alarming to a rural enthuſiaſt was its being framed by the ſame pen, as that elegant diſcourſe on taſte, prefixt to the Enquiry

[* Mr. Lock's.]

into

into our ideas of Sublime and Beautiful. But this clauſe perhaps ſhould properly be regarded, as a ſacrifice of finer feelings to the ſpirit of patriotiſm. Our ingenious legiſlator might only have ſhewn himſelf ready, for the *good* of Britannia, even to have committed her faireſt features into the cuſtody of an inflicter of diſtortion.]

CONCLUSION.

In apology for the ſubject of this eſſay, I would remark with ADDISON, " how " very few have a reliſh of any pleaſures " that are not criminal." Gardening has a more poſitive merit:

--hence the poor are cloth'd, the hungry fed;
Health to himſelf, and to his children bread
The lab'rer bears. POPE.

Is the ſtudy productive of indolence?---let us view its ableſt profeſſors. The ſpirit, which

which animated Hagley, glows with equal luſtre through the darker ſhades of hiſtorical obſcurity. And was it not after a moſt renowned ſtateſman's long attention to rural elegance, that Britain's glories burſting forth upon the world rendered the name of PITT great through all nations? Neither are thoſe without excuſe, who deſert the buſier ſcenes of life for the ſake of amuſing retirement: a diametrically oppoſite practice is much more prejudicial to the community---

Meantime by pleaſure's ſophiſtry allur'd,
From the bright ſun and living breeze ye ſtray;
And deep in London's gloomy haunts immur'd,
Brood o'er your fortune's, freedom's, health's decay.

O blind of choice, and to yourſelves untrue!
The young grove ſhoots, their bloom the fields renew,
The manſion aſks its Lord, the ſwains their friend;
While he doth riot's orgies haply ſhare,
Or tempt the gameſter's dark deſtroying ſnare,
Or at ſome courtly ſhrine with ſlaviſh incenſe bend. AKENSIDE.

Should any one reply----that theſe are only the *vices*, and that the *purſuits* of public life are neceſſary to the welfare of the ſtate; that they extend ſociety and commerce; that they lead to riches, honour, and advancement---" cela eſt bien dit (repondroit " Candide) mais il faut cultiver nôtre jar- " din *."

* This is the concluding ſentence of VOLTAIRE's *Candide*.

FINIS.

A

REVISAL

OF

SOME LATE PUBLICATIONS

ON

GARDENING.

A

REVISAL, &c.

OBSERVATIONS ON MODERN GARDENING.

I come now to a reviſal of the principal publications on gardening ſince 1768. The firſt appeared in 1770 under the title of *Obſervations on modern gardening, illuſtrated by deſcriptions*. Theſe *deſcriptions* (which take up a conſiderable portion of the book) I mean to leave to themſelves, except where particular occaſions require me to refer to them. The writer in ſome reſpects diſcovers himſelf to be a candidate for the reputation of *originality*. His unprecedented uſage of the words *clump* and *riding* is a ſymptom of this humour. He hardly once refers to any printed book. Even his motto

is

is from an unpubliſhed poem. Where he takes a line from MILTON, he calls it a *proverbial expreſſion.* This might be, becauſe the ſame line had been quoted before in the *eſſay*; for the few things, in which he follows that, he gives entirely as his own. Gardening is treated by him much more like a practical art, than a liberal ſcience. Perfect maſter of the buſineſs of a groundworker, he appears to have formed no ſettled principles of deſign, nor even to have thought them neceſſary. Faſhion alone was in all probability the guide he was conducted by; among the properties of which, he ſhews himſelf ſtrongly attached to its perpetual variation. This has led him into an abſurdity taken notice of by Mr. WALPOLE. It is, his objecting to expedients for having already been practiſed with ſucceſs, and ſometimes recommending others on account of their not having been practiſed at all.

all. The writer might have ſeen, that a doctrine of this ſort muſt annihilate the utility of his own precepts after being once followed, and that his book would require to be changed, as often as an almanack.

This author's firſt ſubject is *ground:* on the management of which having expatiated for twenty pages, he apologizes to his readers for giving them *hints* inſtead of *rules*. If ſuch are his hints, to what an unmerciful length muſt his rules have been protracted? After ringing a variety of changes on concavities and convexities, the writer tells us (p. 21) that of theſe precepts there are "very few, which may not "be diſpenſed with." Perhaps to have diſpenſed with them all might have been beſt. For, I believe, the beauty of nature has been much more injured than improved even by *modern* ſhapers of ground. It is a moſt difficult thing, to perform a work of this

this kind to any extent, without making it viſibly artificial. The writer's apology for a *flat* lawn (p. 4) is evaſive throughout. This flat is apparently a *made* one, diſcordant with every thing adjoining to it; it is a manifeſt defect in a piece of ſcenery otherwiſe delightful; and the means taken to diſguiſe it only diſcover the general incongruity.

The article *wood* begins with characteriſtic differences of trees and ſhrubs; ſome of which ſeem more arbitrary than real. But in ſuch matters every one's own eyeſight is the beſt informer.

In p. 35 we have a hint for working by "gradation of tints" in the ſhades of greens. This hint is commended in a note to the firſt book of the Engliſh Garden: but it is borrowed from SHENSTONE's rules for diſtancing and approximating.

In p. p. 36 and 53 is a definition of a

clump,

clump, which gives the word a much greater latitude, than (I believe) was ever affixt to it before, or has been ſince acceeded to. According to this writer, it differs from a wood or grove only in its *dimenſions*, and may conſiſt of only *two* trees. As there is no limitation of *ſhape*, a *ſtrip* of woodland would in this language be a clump. I ſhould imagine, the writer had never heard a ſmall wood called a *ſpring*, or a ſtill ſmaller a *ſpinny*; and he could learn nothing of the kind from Johnſon's dictionary, which allows no place to clump, ſpring, or ſpinny *of plants*. Yet *ſpring* is uſed in this ſenſe twice by MILTON, and frequently by FAIRFAX and DRAYTON, and *ſpinny* by DUGDALE.

Part of what this writer ſays on *planting* has been canvaſſed in the additional remarks to the eſſay. The remainder contains many uſeful maxims---if a reader can but

get a ſight of them, for the cloud of ſuper-numerary words, which obſcures them.

What is ſaid about *water* has alſo been canvaſſed in part, and is not worth dwelling upon any longer.

It is under the article *rocks*, that this author is teaching Nature, to what *other* country ſhe ſhould have carried the Derwent. This article throughout is, as it muſt be, more deſcriptive than didactic. In the attempt to diſtinguiſh rocky ſcenery by the characters of *dignity*, *terror*, and *fancy*, we have nothing either forcible or plauſible. It requires the pen of a BURKE to make ſuch ſubjects amuſing, or to give them any ſemblance of intelligibility. Scenes, which excite admiration in a ſpectator from their pictureſque and romantic novelty, have (in this book's imaginary ſyſtem) their effect attributed to *terror*: and then this viſionary character is to be heightened by appendages

literally

literally *frightful.* The placing an inhabited houſe on the dangerous edge of a precipice is an imp of this childiſh ſuppoſition. Writers on Gardening are ſtrangely out of their track, when they loſe themſelves in the dreary waſte of metaphyſical extravagancy. There may be ſtrong analogies between the pleaſures of imagination and the mental affections; and to trace them may be no unworthy employment of a liberal underſtanding. But to him, who would ſyſtematically deduce every particle of the one from ſome correſpondent particle of the other, it might be ſaid from Horace

Pergis pugnantia ſecum
Frontibus adverſis componere.

When we come to the article *buildings*, the nothingneſs of the whole didactic part precludes any further cenſure. The ſections on *art* have undergone ſufficient animad-

verſion in the additional remarks of the eſſay. *Pictureſque beauty* will be turned back to, when Mr. PRICE's Eſſay is reviewed. The ſections on *character* might almoſt as well have had any other title. The author ſeems often to labour under a peculiar degree of timidity, leſt he ſhould be charged with any determinate aſſertion. Yet I will acknowledge, that too great caution can hardly be uſed, in making *adventitious* character a main principle of gardening. All the nonſenſe of Chineſe fancies (as ſet forth by CHAMBERS) may be reſolved into this ſort of character, when it becomes the leading motive of a deſigner.

We are now to look on the capital feature of this compoſition, which is entitled *General ſubject*. The chief purport of this is, to diſtinguiſh all improved ſpots by the ſeparate denominations of *farm*, *garden*, *park*, and *riding*. To the peculiar charac-

ter

ter of each every ſpecies of deſign is to be made reſpectively conformable. Mr. WALPOLE ſays "he don't find fault with this di-"viſion," yet, as he proceeds, ſeems inclined to modify it a little differently. I certainly *do find fault with* it from beginning to end, and follow (in ſo doing) a moſt reſpectable authority. For, when this book was publiſhed, the candid GEORGE Lord LYTTELTON did not ſcruple to pronounce it too ſyſtematical. The ſyſtem is maintained with the writer's uſual ſhallowneſs. He does not even ſeem aware of his unprecedented ſignification of *riding*. He had better have called it an *airing:* the term would have been juſt as expreſſive of the ſenſe impoſed upon it, and much nearer allied to its unſubſtantial pageantry. This new-fangled riding is characterized by the indefinite property of *pleaſantneſs:* and becauſe no ſuch riding exiſted, that might ſerve for an example,

ample, poor Persfield must be put into Procruſtes' bed, and ſtrained by a cord (of miſerably intertwiſted ſentences) into a *riding-like* garden. Under the name of a ſyſtem we have an arbitrary ſuppoſition, without a ſingle reaſon adduced in ſupport of it: nor can it ſupport itſelf, unleſs by the aſſiſtance of prejudices, which have long impeded the progreſs of taſte. That ſcenes of no kind ſhould be viſibly diſcordant with themſelves, is a tenet, which all deſigners will readily ſubſcribe to. They will alſo probably agree, that great attention ſhould be paid to the peculiar *character* of each particular ſcene: but to fix any mark in it merely for the ſake of inculcating the *denomination* of the incloſure you are in, is in my idea abſolutely repugnant to what ought to be the ſpirit of gardening. I hold it a perfection of this art, not to impreſs a conſciouſneſs of local identity, but rather to

efface

efface in the mind of a ſpectator any notion at all of where he really is. In conformity to this idea, when we would beſtow the higheſt commendations on a portion of landſcape, we call it Elyſian or Arcadian. In ſhort, I conceive, that the primary diſpoſitions of nature ſhould *regulate*, not be ſubſervient to, artificial limitations; and that all rural ſcenery ſhould be improved according to the manner ſuggeſted by itſelf, without regard to nominal diſtinction, or ſyſtematical arrangement.

Having given this opinion about the principal foundation of the remainder of this work, I think it needleſs to enter minutely into the reſt of its particulars. The latter part of it grievouſly deviates from the maxims it ſeemed to ſet out upon. When a reader meets with 'a maypole' 'a neat 'railing on the edge of a ſteep' or 'a for-'mal plantation about a village to mark it

'for

'for property' what can he ſuppoſe?---but that the writer's genius, tired with many a toilſome labour in the land of deſcription, had emigrated for recreation---to the *Paradiſe of Fools*. MILTON's other name for *that* paradiſe is *limbo of vanity*; and this is the paſſion, to which the writer of *Obſervations* is perpetually ſacrificing. All his rules for the formation and decoration of a *riding* are avowedly calculated "to extend the "idea of a ſeat---as evidence of the do-"main." We are told, p. 235, 6, that "the "conſequence of a place is lowered, and "nothing within it engages our notice, "when it is an exhibition only of beauties, "the *property* of which does not belong "to it."

An hæc animos ærugo, et cura peculî
Cum ſemel imbuerit, ſperamus *prædia* fingi
Poſſe, *velut ſacros Druidum*, ſervanda, *re-*
ceſſus? HOR.

When

When this canker of purſe-pride
Once eats into the ſoul, alas! what hope,
Genius ſhould e'er imagine rural haunts,
Worthy th' attention paid to Druid groves?

The paſſages laſt cited from '*Obſervations*' afforded the greateſt ſanction to thoſe illiberal principles of improvement, which are ſo admirably expoſed by Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. PRICE---and I hope with ſucceſs. Indeed the community of ſpectators ſhewed themſelves a long while ago unbiaſſed by ſuch mercenary ſentiments. The taſte of the late Dowager Counteſs of Eſſex was always applauded, for her contrivance of overlooking (from Ruſſel farm*) the grounds of neighbouring ſeats, very manifeſtly not belonging to herſelf. So little did the public think like this author, who would have converted modern gardening from a ſchool of landſcape into a field of oſtentation.

* Near Watford, Herts.

ENGLISH GARDEN.

In 1772 appeared the firſt book of this celebrated poem. A remarkable co-incidence of opinion with my own little eſſay, particularly in ſome of the notes to this poem, made me think it neceſſary to prefix an advertiſement to the re-publication of the eſſay, leſt I ſhould be ſuſpected of plagiariſm from the poet's poſterior work.

Each of the four books was publiſhed ſeparately; and a conſiderable interval of time paſſed between each publication. The three firſt were ſo generally and deſervedly approved of, that it would be downright impertinence in myſelf to enter on a complete review of them. I am thoroughly convinced of the poet's great ſuperiority of knowledge and taſte, as a deſigner; yet I have ventured already to avow in ſome inſtances a difference of opinion with him; but

but it has chiefly happened to be, where he had previouſly differed with himſelf.

The fourth book was certainly not received with the ſame univerſal applauſe, either by the literary world, or lovers of the art. Simplicity is re-invoked at the beginning of it; as if the author was conſcious, that ſhe was preparing to take her flight: ſhe ſeems to have actually fled from his *conſervatory*. There is ſomething extremely novel in the compoſition of this fourth book: I believe, it is the firſt didactic poem, that ever was conſtructed on the plan of a tragi-comedy. Some advocates for the poet have compared this plan to that of VIRGIL's fourth georgic. VIRGIL did not put into a dialogue between Ariſtæus and Cyrene, nor into the mouth of Proteus, what related to the management and policy of bees: nor are his precepts and epiſode *interlarded*. But where we have tale

and inſtructions perpetually interrupting each other, it is almoſt impoſſible for a reader to attend thoroughly to either. The *Latin* georgics might indeed have furniſhed an excellent hint on this occaſion, and cautioned their *Engliſh* rival againſt exhibiting an *American female*, to inveigle the imagination from lawns and groves, and to enervate poetical vigour:

Carpit enim *vires* paulatim, uritque videndo
Fœmina, nec *nemorum* patitur meminiſſe,
nec *herbæ*.

VII-

VILLAGE MEMOIRS

is the title of an epiſtolary novel, which came out in 1775, and contains *ſtrictures on landſcape-gardening*. Nothing in theſe *ſtrictures* is the leaſt alluded to by my prefixt advertiſement. This author's literary conduct towards the Eſſay was perfectly ingenuous. His publication I have referred to more than once, but will take the liberty of extracting a few other paſſages, becauſe they will ſhew the opinion of a writer twenty years ago on ſome of the ſame points, which two more gentlemen of diſtinguiſhed taſte have delivered their ſentiments upon in 1794.

" I hear of nothing but ſtatues, obeliſks, " gazebos, terminations, and a laurel-belt." p. 79.

" I turn away my eyes from falſe orna- " ment, to contemplate nature herſelf in a

" ſim-

" ſimple farm, unbroke-in-upon by a Mr.
" Layout." p. 82.

" Mr. Arlington differs in opinion with
" Mr. Maſon with regard to avenues: if
" I was to decide, I ſhould be ſo old faſh-
" ioned, as to give my verdict againſt the
" poet." p. 123.

" It is ſuppoſed by modern rules, that
" all avenues of courſe muſt be cut down;
" but I am far from thinking, that they
" may not frequently remain to great ad-
" vantage: they muſt be long and wide;
" and ſhould properly lead to a Gothic
" caſtle, tower, or other large or ancient
" building. p. 136."

MR. WALPOLE'S TREATISE.

In 1780 Mr. WALPOLE (now Earl of Orford) favoured the public with a chapter on *modern gardening* (dated 1770) at the end of his Anecdotes of Painting. The noble author is not in the leaſt indebted to the *Eſſay*; but directly contradicts the ſubſtance of it in his ſketch of *ancient* gardening, though the contradiction neceſſarily extends to all the allowed authorities, cited there as proofs. This circumſtance has made me much fuller on *Eaſtern paradiſes*, and *claſſical landſcapes*, in this re-publication.

I do not mean to diſpute, whether HOMER's Garden of Alcinous "was a ſtretch of "luxury the world at that time had never "beheld." But I would obſerve, that the poſition implies (what will hardly be granted) that HOMER muſt have perfectly known, what had been the exact cultivation

tion of the ſurface of the whole terreſtrial globe from the earlieſt period of its exiſtence. Yet, without diſputing the aſſertion, I conceive it to be by no means material to a queſtion about the antiquity of *landſcape-gardening*. Luxury and elegance are not the ſame. The Phæacian garden was adapted to the purpoſe of adminiſtering by its produce to the luxury of the palace. In this view four acres, with extraordinary advantages of ſoil and climate, were not ſo inconſiderable. But whoever looks upon the garden of Alcinous, as deſigned for the moſt beautiful landſcape HOMER could imagine, appears to regard it in a different light from what the poet himſelf did. For though it may not be eaſy to prove, that any better ideas of rural elegance were actually reduced to practice in the days of HOMER, yet that they exiſted in his own imagination, we may conclude from the picture

he

he has drawn (and from the pleaſure he makes it give to a celeſtial ſpectator) of Calypſo's retirement. Such we may almoſt affirm to have been the opinion of the emperor JULIAN; whom Mr. WALPOLE twice mentions in this very treatiſe, but without ſeeming aware of the paſſage (now alluded to) in his panegyric on the empreſs Euſebia. JULIAN obſerves, "it was leſs to be "wondered at, that Ulyſſes ſhould not be "detained by the *artificial* gardens of Al-"cinous; but that it required great ſtrength "of reſolution, to determine on relinquiſh-"ing all the charms of *nature* at Calypſo's "bower."

The paſſage, next to be produced, I am called upon to examine by the motive of ſelf-vindication. "From the days of Ho-"MER to thoſe of PLINY we have *no traces* "to lead our gueſs to what were the gar-"dens of the intervening ages." Nothing

is ſo hazardous in writing as a general negation. I have ſhewn in the preceding eſſay, that there is by no means a total ſilence in ancient authors about Eaſtern Paradiſes; and the emperor JULIAN (in the ſame place I have juſt quoted from) ſpeaks of *gardens and paradiſes*, as ſynonimous. This emperor's Daphne was well known to Mr. WALPOLE: he might have found too, that its glory was at leaſt as old as Strabo's time; and in that diſcovery he would have met with a direct reply to his own aſſertion. Add to theſe paradiſes, the ſeats of COTYS, and all the Roman Villas, and imperial gardens previous to the days of TRAJAN. The accounts of them indeed are but ſlight, but ſurely amount to more than *no traces*.

Mr. WALPOLE ſays, "we do not preciſely "know, what our Anceſtors meant by a "*bower*, it was probably an arbour." This I apprehend to be a miſtake; and that its

ſenſe

ſenſe of arbour is not older than the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's time. The proof of this muſt be by a full diſquiſition on the ſenſe and uſage of the word; which, as it is likely to be unentertaining to the generality of readers, ſhall be put by itſelf in an appendix. Mr. WALPOLE proceeds thus: "Sometimes it meant the whole frit-"tered encloſure, and in one inſtance it "certainly included a labyrinth. Roſa-"mond's bower was indiſputably of that "kind, though whether compoſed of walls "or hedges we cannot determine." Indiſputable as this ſeemed, I apprehend, that Roſamond's Bower was neither a garden, nor part of a garden, but ſome portion of a manſion. This will alſo be proved in the ſame appendix. Perhaps it is concluded, that *Bower* muſt have meant an encloſure from the very name of Havering *in the Bower*. But here is a miſtake ſeemingly

minute, yet concluſive to the point. Not *in the* *, but *atte* Bower has been the *legal* name of Havering for a number of centuries, and its *common* name at this day is *Havering Bower*. When the inhabitants ſpeak of the Bower *(alone)*, they always mean the *palace* that ſtood there. What I have more to ſay of this place, ſhall alſo be reſerved for the appendix.

It has been my misfortune to differ from the noble author as an antiquary; but, as a gardener, I find myſelf much indebted to his information. With great accuracy, and ſtrong marks of attentive obſervation, he traces the riſe and progreſs of modern improvements. Not only his hiſtorical anecdotes, but much more his critical remarks ſhew an intimate acquaintance with the

* We meet with Havering *in the* Bower in Speed's Chronicle, where he ſpeaks of the death of Henry 4th's widow. I know of no other writer, that calls it ſo.

ſub-

ſubject. Yet a veneration for one of the moſt ſuperlative excellencies in gardening will not permit me to cloſe this review, without once more expreſſing a difference of opinion. I cannot in any degree aſſent to a reprobation of ſcenes, intended to excite the pleaſures of melancholy. Happy was it for the art of gardening, that ſome of our greateſt deſigners entertained not any idea of this ſort. We might ſtill have wanted many a delightful gloom, with all the heart-felt ſenſations engendered by its magical impreſſion.

Dear regions of ſilence and ſhade!

beloved by paſtoral SHENSTONE, congenial to the contemplative MILTON, and even by the courtly WALLER celebrated and revered.

In ſuch green palaces the firſt kings reign'd;
Slept in their ſhades, and angels entertain'd:

With

With ſuch old counſellors they did adviſe,
And by frequenting ſacred groves grew wiſe.
Free from th' impediments of light and noiſe,
Man thus retir'd his nobler thoughts employs. WALLER's *St. James's Park.*

APPENDIX ON BOWERS.

Bower in Engliſh (according to Mr. MANNING's edition of Lye's dictionary) is exactly the ſame with the Saxon *bur* or *bure*. In the Saxon authorities (there referred to) *bur* ſtands for Abraham's *tent*, for the ſacred *tabernacle*, for *parlour*, or *chamber*, and for *bed-chamber*. This information Mr. MANNING very obligingly gave me ſome years ago. He alſo informed me, that the

the characteriſtic mark of the Saxon word was *privacy*, and that *bur* ſignified any erection for private uſe, whether the whole of a building, or only an apartment. I find it uſed alſo for a *private room* in the Chronicon Saxonicum, p. 149. In a poem * printed in Hickes's Theſaurus, and ſuppoſed to be written before Henry 2d's reign, *bure* is uſed for a *buttery*, and *boures* for private rooms in an abbey. And Matthew † Paris tranſlates *bur* into *thalamus*. When the orthography was changed into *boure*, the word ſtill retained it's Saxon ſenſes ‡. That miſtreſs of language Queen Elizabeth perfectly underſtood its primitive ſignification, when ſhe tranſlated "in hoc

* See WARTON's *Engliſh Poetry*, vol. 1. p. 9.

† Ad an. 1170.

‡ The beſt ale lay in my *boure*. P. P's. *Viſions*.

Bliſſing halles, chambres, kitchines and *boures*.

CHAUCER's *Wife of Bath's Tale*.

In both theſe places it ſeems to mean a *cellar*.

contu-

" *contubernio* vita degenda eſt" (Sen. Epiſ. 107) by " in this rotten *bower* our life we " muſt lead *." Bower certainly might (conſiſtently with its original import) have been alſo uſed for an *arbour*; but I cannot find any authentic and deciſive inſtance of ſuch uſage, till towards the cloſe of the 16th century. *Chamber* was always its moſt common meaning, as long as it held a place in our *living* language. Mr. WARTON † has proved this to have been the caſe in poetry; and an old vocabulary ‡, ſuppoſed to have been

* See Harrington's Nugæ Antiquæ, vol. 1. p. 136.

† See note 45 on Comus in Warton's edition of Milton's juvenile poems. Mr. Warton might have brought an inſtance much older than CHAUCER. For in the metrical legend of Seint Vonefrede [Wenefride] publiſhed by Bp. FLEETWOOD, the virgin ſays to Cradok,

Ich wole gone to *boure:*

and in the proſe legend (publiſhed by HEARNE with Peter Langtoft) her correſpondent words are " ſhe wolde go in " to hur *chambre.*"

‡ *Promptorium parvulorum*---folio printed by Pinſon 1499. This

been compiled about 1440, explains *bowre* by *thalamus*, *conclave*. Alſo in a plain narrative of the entertainment of Princeſs Catherine on her intended marriage to Prince Arthur, 1501, we read "Uppon ſaturdaie "becauſe it was raynie, and not cleere ne "ſtable weather, the company of nobles "made paſtime in their *bowers* and cham-"bers," and again, "daunced in their "*bowers* and chambers all that ſame "daye." *

From *chamber* to *reſidence* the tranſition was eaſy. In this latter ſenſe it is often uſed by SPENSER † and SKELTON ‡, and once at

This exceeding ſcarce book is in Dr. Hunter's Muſeum; which copy I have had the complete uſe of, by the favour of my worthy friend Dr. David Pitcairn.

* See Leland's Collectanea (ed. 1770.) vol. 5. p. 363, and 364.

† It is in this way, that Spencer calls a *garden* the *Bower* of bliſs. But the appellation no more proves *bower* to ſignify a garden, than *ſeat* would have ſignified a garden, if he had called it the *ſeat* of bliſs.

‡ In Skelton's *Speake Parrot* it ſtands for the parrot's cage.

leaſt even by CHAUCER* in like manner as by the elegant DUNBAR in his *golden terge*, who ſpeaks of birds in blooming thickets, as " within their bouris." Such expreſſions by degrees brought the word to ſignify not only *arbours* (whether natural or† artificial) but even the *ſhades* beneath them; and ſeem alſo to have occaſioned its original meaning, by the middle of the 17th century, to be moſtly forgotten. Of this we have a remarkable inſtance in Bathurſt's tranſlation of Spenſer's Shepherd's calender into latin, where he renders this line in *Auguſt*

(Than bed, or *bower*, both which I fill with cries)

* See Chaucer's *Cuckowe and Nightingale* ver. 667.

† By a line in Browne's *Britannia's Paſtorals*
(Then to the *arbors* walke, then to the *bowres*) B. 2. Song 3. one might conclude, that bowre was then uſed for a *natural* but not an *artificial* arbour.

Quam

Quam lectus, quamque *umbra domûs:* hæc
irrigo fletu.

This corrupted uſage, being the only one in vogue, induced Junius to derive *bower* from *bough*, and interpret it by *arbour*. And JOHNSON, notwithſtanding all his animadverſions on the errors of Junius, has in this article abſolutely outvied the abſurdity of his predeceſſor. He adopts both the erroneous derivation, and the expoſition by *arbour*; and to prove the latter produces three examples. Of theſe, the firſt (from Milton) is quite nugatory; the ſecond (from Waller) is worſe; for it would make the poet turn heaven into arbours. His third inſtance is from Pope's Odyſſey:

Refreſh'd they wait them to the *bower* of
ſtate,
Where, circled by his peers, Atrides ſate.

This *bower of ſtate* (produced as an exam-

ple of *arbour*) happens to be a magnificent room of audience in the palace of Menelaus. Such was this lexicographer's *learning* or *diligence*; and ſuch the inaccuracies which almoſt every page of his dictionary ſwarms with; and ſuch the labours, which he had the conſcience to complain of not being rewarded for beforehand.

We know, that the word *bower* at this day lives only in poetry, and that modern bards chiefly uſe it for *imbowering ſhade*, or *a ſhady encloſure*. Yet ſome of them ſtill apply it occaſionally according to its original import. POPE does, as we have ſeen already; and ſo does PRIOR in his Solomon:

To lead her forth to a diſtinguiſh'd *bower*,
And bid her dreſs the *bed*.

It is ſo uſed, as early as in DRAYTON's *miſeries of Queen Margaret*.

[Led him through London to the Biſhop's
bower.]

and

and as late as in SHENSTONE's *School-miſtreſs*.

In knightly caſtles, or in ladies' bowers.

ROSAMOND's Bower is ſpoken of by FABIAN, who ſays, "this *houſe* after ſome "writers was named Labyrinthus, or Dædalus worke, or *howſe* wroughte like "unto a knot in a garden called a maze." In ſome verſes of the age of Henry 6th (printed by Hearne with Robert of Gloceſter) we read,

Att Wodeſtocke for hure he made a *toure*,
That is called Roſemoundes boure.

A tower at this period was uſually but a ſmall part of a manſion. Authors nearer to the age of Roſamond ſtyle it only a *chamber**. And Mr. WARTON ſhews, that

* Knyghton inter Decem Scriptores col. 2395, and Higden according to the Engliſh Polychronicon printed by Treveris, p. 279.

a *Ro-*

a *Roſamond's chamber* was to be found in many other of Henry 2d's palaces †. How writers within the two laſt centuries may have miſrepreſented Roſamond's Bower is hardly worth enquiring.

That the *Bower* of HAVERING was only another name for the king's *houſe*, is confirmed by traditionary report, not yet worn out. When I firſt reſided there in 1770, the miniſter told me of an old man, who could remember many *chimnies* of the *old bower* ſtanding. Havering *atte* Bower is the name of this royal demeſne in its charter from Edward 4th. The ſame appellation may be traced conſiderably higher. There are two inſtruments ſigned by Edward 3d in the 5th year of his reign dated *Haveryng atte boure**. Should it be aſked, why the royal ſeat at Havering was ſo particularly

* Engliſh Poetry, vol. 1. p. 304 note.

† Madox's Firma Burgi, 64 and 163.

diſ-

diſtinguiſhed by the name of a *bower*, there are reaſons (not improbable) to be given for it. The characteriſtic of *privacy* ſeems to have eminently obtained there in days of old. Its territory is ſtill nearly ſurrounded by the wild foreſt of Hainault, and that territory itſelf, which retains the title of a *park*, beautifully diverſified with rolling hills and dales; and muſt have been infinitely more beautiful, when covered with thoſe woods of oak, that the ravage of the laſt century * deſtroyed. Not that theſe particular circumſtances are at all neceſſary to account for the name of a *bower*. Mr. MANNING has ſhewn me by many inſtances, there is no ſuch ſingularity in the denomination as is commonly thought: for that the very ſame meaning is conveyed by the

* Richard Dean had Havering Manor in Eſſex, whoſe park he unmercifully demoliſhed.

Parliamentary Hiſtory, vol. 23. p. 194.

ter-

termination of *bury*, affixt to ſeats in Hertfordſhire, and elſewhere. Thus Caſhio-*bury* means the chief *detached ſeat* in Caſhio hundred, and Gorham*bury* the *ſeat* of Robert de Gorham abbot of St. Albans*.

* That the termination *bury* was ſometimes derived from *bur*, appears in an old monkiſh writer (Galfridus de fontibus) quoted in Battely's Antiquitates S. Edmundi Burgi p. 24, who tranſlates *Maydeneburie* into *virginalis thalamus*.

ESSAY ON THE PICTURESQUE*.

I take it for granted, that the firſt anonymous publication of my own inſignificant eſſay never chanced to fall into the hands of Mr. PRICE. If it had, he could not well have avoided remarking a ſtrong co-incidence of ſentiment on many points, between himſelf and its author. Theſe it is not my intention to particularize: what is *new* in the later treatiſes on gardening falls more particularly under the province of this examination.

Mr. PRICE begins by ſetting aſide "the

* My reviſal of this book was written, before Mr. PRICE's anſwer to Mr. REPTON appeared. Though the anſwer is much longer, than might have been expected from its immediate ſubject, it applies but in very few inſtances to any thing ſaid in the reviſal. Wherever this ſupplemental piece at all affects my own eſſay, I have already added a note to point out the circumſtance; and ſhall do the ſame in the reviſal.

 "authority

" authority of the perſons who have gained " moſt reputation by works of gardening." I take the perſons, here alluded to, not to be the ſame, whom I have always underſtood to have acquired the greateſt reputation in this art; but only ſuch profeſt improvers, as have had the moſt practice. Taking the ſentence in this ſenſe I perfectly agree with it. But to allow *moſt reputation* to theſe perſons, is quite contradictory to Mr. PRICE's own way of thinking. For in what does the *reputation* of an artiſt conſiſt? is it not in having the approbation of *good judges?* and would Mr. PRICE look upon any man to be a judge of gardening, that ſhould prefer the deſigns of Brown to thoſe of Hamilton? That a mere *number* of admirers confers reputation I have already denied, and beg leave to ſtrengthen my arguments by a reference to a favourite author

thor of Mr. PRICE's. When * Partridge (in *Tom Jones*) goes to the play, he prefers the actor, that played the king, to Garrick in Hamlet. Fielding clearly meant Partridge's taſte for that of the *multitude*; and (according to Mr. PRICE's *conceſſion*) not Garrick, but the other actor *had gained moſt reputation*. Yet if any author had ſaid ſo in print, he would have made his readers ſtare again. I ſhould not have dwelt ſo long on this ſentence, but that MR. PRICE's manner of *granting*, what he cannot in his own mind *admit*, has really been the ſource of miſ-apprehenſion in myſelf throughout the whole of his book.

* It ſtrikes me as exceeding ſingular, that Mr. KNIGHT in his *ſecond* edition of *the Landſcape* (publiſhed ſince this reviſal went to the preſs) ſhould in a note (p. 48) have made uſe of the ſame ſtroke of Fielding's, by way of illuſtration, though for a different purpoſe. For it does not appear to be at all connected either with Mr. KNIGHT's ſubject, or my own. Yet neither of us could poſſibly have had the idea ſuggeſted by the other.

Willing to give a better turn to the ſtudy of practical improvers, Mr. PRICE ſends them to the works of the moſt eminent painters of landſcape: but this he does with a plain acknowledgement of the preference due to the ſtudy of nature. The latter declaration ought at leaſt to be as ſtrongly impreſt on the writer's own memory, as he would have it on that of the reader's. But in p. 7, he objects to works of genius in real landſcapes, becauſe they have not "ſtood the teſt of ages;" and ſubjoins, it is hardly poſſible they ſhould, on account of the change, which the growth and decay of trees muſt occaſion in them. This objection does not ſtrike me, as having much force in it. It might be of weight, if all rural deſigns were compoſed of young plantations. But as the beſt deſigners have worked upon old materials, they have immediately created real landſcapes: or (as at

Paine's

Paine's Hill) time has brought them to maturity. The change ariſing from the growth and decay of trees is ſo gradual, and ſo eaſily obviated by attention, that the mere identity rather than the *character* of a ſcene is affected by it. For theſe reaſons I ſhould ſend an improver not only to Claude and Gaſpar, but alſo to Hamilton and Shenſtone. If the growth and decay of trees make real landſcapes too fluctuating for patterns, they muſt equally render any imitation of a picture defective at firſt, or defective by mutability, or both.

Having thus taken out a ſtatute of impotency againſt Nature, Mr. PRICE ſets up painted landſcapes (p. 8), as "the *only* mo-"dels that approach to perfection" for deſigners of real ſcenery to work by. There certainly requires ſome diſtinction or explanation, to make this *excluſive* reference

to

to pictures conſonant with what is ſaid p. 20 about bye-lanes, and p. 237 about parks and foreſts. That an improver cannot find *all* that he wants in paintings *only*, is plain from p. 8, where an inherent inſufficiency in the imitative art, to do perfect juſtice to rural graces, is admitted. This defect of the pencil the writer no further ſpecifies; and yet would have us take for granted, that it muſt be immaterial. It is really to be lamented by lovers of gardening, that a perſon, ſo well qualified for the taſk, ſhould not have entered into an accurate ſtatement of the inſufficiency of paintings to inſtruct a garden-deſigner. As the taſk has not been performed by an abler hand, I feel it my own buſineſs to attempt it to the beſt of my information.

The ſection on Pictureſque Beauty in '*Obſervations*' (reſerved to be conſidered in this

this place) ſays plainly of pictures, "they "must be uſed only as *ſtudies*, not as *mo-* "*dels*." So far I confeſs agreeing with it. What is further ſaid there about eſſential differences between pictures and ſcenes, is done in ſo confuſed a manner, that I ſhall barely avail myſelf of ſome of the matter, without quoting any more of the words.

One inſufficiency of pictures, as models for gardeners, is (in my idea) their limitation of extent on either hand. There is often a certain portion of a ſcene, which, if viewed between a pair of blinkers, may form an agreeable landſcape. But take the blinkers away, and the landſcape altogether ſhall be no longer pleaſing. Every landſcape-painter puts blinkers on the ſpectator. But a gardener muſt look *on either hand*, before he ventures to apply what the painter has ſet immediately before him. I

have

have ſeen ſtrong inſtances of the neceſſity of this diſcrimination in *real* landſcapes. I remember a beautiful viſta-ſcene in a certain park, where the view was as much confined on each ſide, as it is by the edges of a piece of canvas. This viſta was imitated at a neighbouring ſeat; and the imitation (as far as its own extent was concerned) might have had the advantage: yet, for want of *lateral boundaries* to the eye-ſight, it had loſt the appearance of a reach of retirement; and the whole was inconſiderable and unmeaning. If this obſervation is juſt, how ſhall a gardener learn from pictures "*unity of character?*"

Many objects in a landſcape (as I have already hinted in my additional remarks) owe their effect and propriety to the ſpectator's being precluded from a nearer approach to them. Within the limits of neat-

neſs

neſs they would often be abſolutely offenſive*. Can then ſuch objects be made the ſame uſe of in rural decorations, as in paintings? †

Alſo (as has likewiſe been hinted under article WRIGHT) many pieces of natural ſcenery (declivities ‡ in particular) can't be re-

* Mr. Price ſeeems to have been aware of this objection, and attempts to obviate it (p. 26) in ſmall things by ſubſtitutes:---in the ſame way as SHENSTONE ſays

Or in the horrid bramble's room
Bid careleſs groups of roſes bloom.

But I apprehend, that this remedy does not go to the whole of the objection, and that many abſurdities in laying out grounds would have no bad effect in a picture. The neceſſity of a number of deviations from a rule muſt make that rule pernicious, without a ſtring of exceptions *inſeparably* annexed to it.

† Mr. KNIGHT, on the principle adopted in the text, has inſerted ſome additional lines in the firſt book of the *Landſcape* at ver. 257. He differs indeed from myſelf, in chooſing to diminiſh the effect of his own forcible obſervation.

‡ This is one of the few points adverted to in this reviſal, which Mr. PRICE's *Letter* meets. Inſtead of combating the objection, he fairly admits it to be true. All that he adds to palliate it, is foreign to the purpoſe for which it is here adduced. I don't deny the 'affinity between painting and gar-'dening,' but object to ſetting up pictures for *perfect models*. A

 model

repreſented by the painter *from the ſtation*, whence they ſhould be principally conſidered by a landſcape-gardener. So that this inſtructor leaves the pupil moſt in the lurch, where aſſiſtance is moſtly required. Such ſcenes indeed are ſeldom attempted by painters: when they do attempt them, they become, inſtead of guides to gardeners, their arrant deceivers.

No inſignificant minutiæ are here oppoſed to Mr. PRICE's doctrine. My objections to it are few in number, but widely comprehenſive. They convince me, that an embelliſher of grounds ſhould look to pictures as to a ſubordinate ſtudy. This "ſtandard of an higher kind" ſeems nearly reduced to a level with Harlequin's much-extolled horſe:

model that muſt be departed from by thoſe that are to copy it, is neceſſarily a *model* no longer. This is plain truth: and all that can be ſaid about it, *from* the point, will never make it otherwiſe.

One

One fault he had---a fault indeed!
And what was that? the horſe was *dead.*

PRIOR'S *Alma.*

Regarding pictures only as a *ſtudy* makes the reference to Shakeſpeare ſufficiently appoſite: of the *copiers* of SHAKESPEARE I gave an opinion long ago in the miſcellaneous remarks of the Eſſay; and CHURCHILL pointedly derides

Whom FIELDING's humour led aſtray.

And indeed, whatever general advantages may accrue to exhibiters of nature from hints in Claude and Shakeſpeare, it ſhould ſeem, that theſe great maſters themſelves were the more ſucceſsful, for having had no ſuch models to look to.

In p. 9 are reprobated "the clumps, the "belts, the made water, and the eternal "ſmoothneſs and ſameneſs of a finiſhed "place." I have no doubt, but that I per-

fectly agree with Mr. PRICE's *meaning*, and had partly ſaid the ſame thing in print 27 years ago. My objection to the cenſure is the wording it: from which I conceive it might be conſtrued into an abſolute prohibition of gardening---eſpecially by thoſe, who have formed their idea of a *clump* from its definition in '*Obſervations*.' Mr. PRICE explains what *he* means by clump 200 pages after; and, as his explanation makes it more limited than it is in general underſtood, his readers could never gueſs its meaning here. The total excluſion of clumps (in the uſual ſenſe of the word) would, according to my opinion, tend to ſubſtitute in their room, what Mr. PRICE might properly ſtyle "*crincum crancums*." For during the infancy of plantations compactneſs is neceſſary to their thriving; and, when cloſe and compact, if their outline is not eaſily rounded, they exhibit a hideous mul-

multiplicity of nooks and angles. *Here I can't help mentioning a difficulty, which profeſſors lie under for the credit of their works, where new plantations are requiſite. They ought frequently to plant ſuch clumps, as may eaſily be reduced by degrees into wild and irregular groups. This reduction is generally left to proprietors, who as generally neglect it, or perform it injudiciouſly, and whoſe errors are as generally aſcribed to the firſt planner.

Under article SOUTHCOTE I have chimed in with Mr. PRICE about *belts*. That he is

* I obſerve, that Mr. REPTON (in his letter to Mr. PRICE) has ſaid nearly the ſame thing with myſelf. Yet I imagine, he will not be diſpleaſed at my letting my own remark continue unexpunged. It ſhews a concurrence of obſervation with himſelf, in one, who has ſtudied gardening all his life-time, and never was partial to mechanical ground-workers. But I would adviſe Mr. REPTON, not to take ſuch a mill-ſtone about his own neck, as a vindication of BROWN's clumps. Let him turn back to the article under that artiſt's name, and ſee what I have vouched for truth of the clumps at *Latimers*.

not

not diſguſted with every piece of *made-water* is evident from the latter part of his Eſſay; but his readers have 240 pages to go through, before they diſcover it. They muſt travel almoſt as far to find (p. 241) that he deems *ſmoothneſs* a characteriſtic beauty in a lawn. Can it be expected of readers, that, in order to underſtand a paragraph towards the beginning of a book, they ſhould (of themſelves) ſearch the latter end of it, for ſuch explanations of the paſſage as may chance to be ſcattered there?

Though I cannot agree to ſetting up painted landſcapes as the only models for profeſſors of a different art, yet I muſt allow, that an excellent uſe is made of one of Claude's pictures, to exemplify the falſe taſte of conceited ground-workers. Claude is pitched upon (p. 11) "as the moſt ornamented of all the great maſters," and perhaps the only one (for that reaſon) fit to be brought

brought into the compariſon. Elſe I had rather have found the quiet and romantic ſcenes of Gaſpar* recommended for rural deſigns, than the richer compoſitions of Claude. Claude's merit, as a painter, is indubitably conſummate: but is the ſame preference due to his mere ſelections of ſcenery, conſidered in themſelves?

> Or by *his* ſoftning pencil ſhewn
> Aſſume they beauties, not their own?
>
> SHENSTONE.

I freely declare, that very few of Claude's pictures (even of his beſt-choſen ſubjects) ever excited in myſelf an ardent deſire of being tranſported to the ſpots, from which they were taken. They always ſeemed to me rather wonderful combinations of objects by an effort of genius, than what were

* Mr. PRICE's *Letter*, p. 86, ſeems partly to accord with this idea.

likely to have exiſted together anywhere in reality.

The ſecond chapter contains a very pertinent deſcription of *intricacy*, and has made me ſuppreſs an intended remark of my own---one part of which not ſeeing foreſtalled, I will here inſert it. To intricacy I would refer that moſt engaging feature of landſcape---a portion of lawn on the ſlope of a hill, peeping above wood, and every way encloſed by it. Beauties of this kind appear to be by no means unfrequent in the grounds of Norbury.

In the third chapter commences the diſquiſition on the *Picturesque*, and the diſputation with Mr. Gilpin. From this place to the end of the firſt part, the principles of improvement are ſo entangled with the philoſophical enquiry, that I ſhall not endeavour to extricate them. I was the leſs inclined to examine this part of the book,

becauſe

becauſe it proceeds on an hypotheſis I am by no means convinced of. It pre-ſuppoſes our ideas of *ſublime* and *beautiful* to be clearly ſettled. I have heard indeed, that the well-known Enquiry into the origin of theſe ideas was in higheſt eſtimation with the deep philoſophers of France. It may poſſibly have its advocates too in ſome faſhionable circles, where the merit of a book depends on the circumſtance of its author's being faſhionable. Reaſons of this ſort are far too ponderous to be removed by refutation. But the majority of thinking and learned men, whom it has been my lot to converſe with on ſuch ſubjects, are as well perſuaded of *terror's* being the cauſe of *ſublime*, as that Tenterden ſteeple is of Goodwin ſands. Neither can they comprehend, why beauty's component parts are rejected as *ſuch*, merely becauſe no one of

 them

them *ſingly* can always conſtitute it. Then they find (in their ſtead) a definition made up of *indefinites*.

Beauty is ſomething, nothing he'll expreſs:
Keep its ingredients out of mind, and gueſs.

Of the ſecond part---the two firſt chapters have been commented on in various places, as occaſion required. The third chapter ſtrikes me (I own) as unfiniſhed; but being publiſhed, has a paſſage or two, that call for notice. The chief of them is this, p. 252: "A piece of *ſtill* water with *ſuch* "a thin graſſy edge looks like a tempo- "rary *overflowing*. To give the whole a "character of age, of permanency, and ca- "pacity, it requires ſome height, ſome de- "gree of abruptneſs in part of the banks--- "ſome appearance of having been gradu- "ally worn and undermined by the *action* "of

" of the water."----what! of the *ſtill* water? yet ſo it is ſtated to be. To take the ſentence in order. Finding no antecedent to *ſuch*, I can underſtand by *thin graſſy edge* nothing elſe than a *margin*. While the margin appears at all above the water, it precludes the idea of an *over*-flowing; and the ſtranger who ſhould " ſuppoſe, that the " flood would go off" would be HORACE's *ruſtic:*

Ruſticus expectat, dum defluat amnis.

The *overflowing* then is reduced to mere *fulneſs*. If *this* is a fault in a river, how improperly does the Spirit in MILTON's *Comus* apoſtrophize Sabrina!

May thy *brimmed* waves for this
Their full tribute never miſs
From a thouſand petty rills,
That tumble down the ſnowy hills!

Nor was CLAUDIAN leſs out in ſaying

Vivo de pumice fontes
Roſcida mobilibus *lambebant gramina* rivis.
De Raptu Proſ. L. 2. v. 103.

Rock-born ſprings
Made their ſwift riv'lets *kiſs the dewy graſs*.*

I will not pay ſo bad a compliment to Mr. PRICE's taſte, as to argue about the ſigns of *being worn* in the banks, when the water riſes to the upper edge of them. I will only aſk, whether Nature is a more pleaſing object in a dwindled and ſhrivelled condition, than when her vigour "is as great, her "beauty as freſh, and her looks as charm-"ing, as if ſhe newly came out of the "forming hands of her Creator?" †

The hint in p. 254 for breaking the

* See alſo, to the ſame point, Engliſh Garden, b. 3. ver. 418.

† Lord Shafteſbury's moraliſts, part 3. ſec. 1.

curves

curves in the lines of rivers ſhews the writer a perfect maſter of the ſubject. His precept is the better for being but a hint. Irregularities are not to be faſhioned by rules; they muſt be created by ſallies of genius. I am not equally pleaſed with the *literal* argument (p. 256) againſt *ſheets* of water. Strong contraſts may ſometimes be produced by them; more eſpecially (as in COLLINS's *Ode to Evening*)

where ſome *ſheety* lake
Cheers the lone heath.

Here I conclude my reviſal of the *particulars* of the *Eſſay on Pictureſque*. But an opinion ſeems to run through it, which I hold myſelf bound to declare my diſſent from. The opinion I mean is 'that none ſhould 'preſume to garden, who have no pre-'vious knowledge of painting.' The gardening maxims in Mr. PRICE's Eſſay intimately

mately accord with SHENSTONE's practice; yet *his* name is not to be found there. I can conceive but the following reaſon for this omiſſion. No ſuch anecdote has been recorded of SHENSTONE, as is there related of HAMILTON. Then SHENSTONE's merit in deſign fully refutes this ſuppoſed opinion ---unleſs all his admirers are mere dupes of illuſion, for giving way to the impulſe of pleaſure excited by his ſcenes, when they ſhould firſt have enquired, whether Shenſtone was a proficient in painting. If HAMILTON by ſtudying pictures improved his real landſcapes, it is to be remembered that he was *previouſly* a gardener. His thoughts were engaged by their favourite purſuit, which ſaved them from being cramped and vitiated by painting prejudices. "A narrow "pedantic manner of conſidering all ob-"jects" (as Mr. PRICE, p. 3, expreſſes it) is what very few, when thoroughly attached

to

to any profeſſion, are quite exempt from. And to make picture-bigots the ſole comptrollers of gardening would be moſt inſufferable. In vain ſhall we have reſcued the captive from her ſlaviſh ſubjection to Architecture, if ſhe is to be ſurrendered up to another domineering taſk-miſtreſs, nearly as unfounded in her pretenſions. It would be ſtrange indeed, if the *general* arrangement of rural-ſcenery could *only* be known by ſtudying particular parts of it, and that too merely for the purpoſe of imitating them by a particular art---to the limited efficacy of which art each ſelection muſt be ſubſervient, and the repreſentation of it always ſeen, as from an identical point, and by the hood-winkt. He, that very properly exclaims againſt tethering a ſpectator with a belt, would make nothing of fixing him like a ſtatue. The powers of genius, extenſively diſtributed, will never ſubmit

mit to having any prohibitory reſtriction impoſed upon them; nor ever be brought to entertain an undue deference for the intolerant mis-claim of pictorial uſurpation.

'Tis Nature only gives excluſive right
To reliſh her ſupreme delight;
She, where ſhe pleaſes, kind or coy,
Who furniſhes the ſcene, and forms us to enjoy. SHENSTONE.

A reformation in the too uſual, though not general, practice of modern improvers is undoubtedly much to be wiſhed, if only in abatement of proprietary vanity. Whether Mr. PRICE's mode of promoting this end is adapted to enſure ſucceſs, the reſult muſt diſcover. I ſhould have thought it more conducive to his laudable intent, to have taken every opportunity of expreſsly qualifying every one of his cenſures, that needed it. The manifeſtation of candour

is

is a powerful argument to convince by. When readers, who would willingly embelliſh their grounds, meet with the oil of encouragement diſtilled in ſcanty drops, and ſoon waſhed away again with a torrent of reprobation, they are moſt likely to be abſolutely deterred from attempting anything of the kind. Thus the poor rural proprietor, under an implied interdiction for not being initiated in the myſteries of the pencil, feels himſelf diſheartened from the proſecution of a beneficial and civilizing amuſement: he is almoſt rendered,

like our firſt wretched father,
When from his bliſsful garden he was driven.

— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —

Then with the cheerleſs partner of his woe,
He turn'd him to the world, that lay below;
There, for his Eden's happy plains, beheld
A barren, wild, uncomfortable field.

ROWE's *Lady Jane Gray.*

HOR. Lib. I. Od. 37.

Nunc eſt bibendum, nunc pede libero
Pulſanda tellus;

nunc Saliaribus
Ornare pulvinar Deorum
Tempus erat dapibus, ſodales.

Antehac nefas depromere Cæcubum
Cellis avitis, dum Capitolio
Regina dementes ruinas,
Funus et imperio parabat,

Contaminato cum grege turpium
Morbo virorum:

quidlibet

PARAPHRASED UPON EARL HOWE'S VICTORY OF JUNE 1ſt, 1794.

Now may true Britons quaff their bowls,
Now freely uſe the bounding dance,
In ſpite of Envy's furious ſhoals,
And all the raging Pow'rs of France;
Now, hearty comrades, o'er ſecurer coaſts
At board convivial thank the God of hoſts.

Timeleſs had feaſt-rites been before,
Whilſt Gaul with gaſconading throat
So madly menac'd Britain's ſhore
As if to ruin's prey devote,
Nay hurl'd deſtruction at fair Freedom's pile
Fixt on broad baſe, deep-rooted as her Iſle.

What blood-ſtain'd droves ſhock mortal view!
Yet boaſt themſelves of human race:
An impious, mind-diſtemper'd crew,
Nature's foul blot, and Man's diſgrace:

Swoln

quidlibet impotens
Sperare, fortunaque dulci
Ebria.

Sed minuit furorem
Vix una ſoſpes navis ab ignibus,
Mentemque lymphatam Mareotico
Redegit in veros timores
Cæſar, ab Italiâ volantem
Remis adurgens (accipiter velut
Molles columbas, aut leporem citus
Venator in campis nivalis
Æmoniæ) daret ut catenis
Fatale monſtrum.

Swoln with all-licens'd hopes abroad they roam,
Intoxicate with ſpoils of pillag'd home.

Their captur'd and their ſhatter'd fleet
Shall make theſe deathful monſters bow, *
Cool'd of Loire's drink's delirious heat
By terrors of the fire of HOWE,
Who with leſs ſtrength, compenſated in ſkill,
Bids Britiſh valour its great end fulfil.

As hawk's, or hunter's ardent courſe
Sweeps with ſwift ravage air, or plain,
HOWE's burſts of rapid vollied force
From giant-navy free the main:
Loudly his Country's ſhouts in one accord
All hail the MIGHTY VICTOR, MIGHTY LORD. †

* This prediction, as far as concerned its principal objects (Robeſpiere and his accomplices) was ſoon verified.

† Theſe four words are taken from GRAY's Ode on the Bards.

VERSES ADDREST TO GEORGIANA DOWAGER COUNTESS SPENCER, AS ACCOMPANYING A COPY OF THIS BOOK PRESENTED TO THE COUNTESS.

Thou, by whoſe converſe at our youthlieſt
age
Grac'd was the boy, (ſeaſon I ſtill adore,
Through rooted mem'ry of thy Father ſage,
Patron of elegance and virtue's lore)

Look on this effort of that early friend
To trace fair Nature in her faireſt dreſs;
Yet O! may thy known candour con-
deſcend
Thy quickneſs of diſcernment to repreſs!

Nor

Nor marvel, I ſhould treat of bliſsful ſcenes
When deſolation racks the world around;
Safe is each rural haunt midſt druid greens
Scatter'd o'er Britain's venerated ground:

For GEORGE with care paternal guards his realm,
While SPENCER's active pow'rs rule its vaſt nautic helm.

WRITTEN JULY, 1795.

FINIS.

G.R III.